

THE  
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

NOVEMBER, 1849.

NO. VI.

---

ART. XXXIX.—THE SECT SYSTEM.

HISTORY OF ALL THE RELIGIOUS DENOMINATIONS, &c., *Second improved and portrait edition of Rupp's work, published by John Winebrenner, V. D. M.* Harrisburg, Pa.

*Second Article.*

1. Our sect system is exceedingly *irrational*. We can conceive of divisions in the church that might be in a certain sense rational and necessary, and so capable of some scientific representation. The original distinction of Protestantism from Catholicism, and the resolution of the first again into the two great confessions Lutheran and Reformed, have this character. They have their ground in the idea of Christianity itself; they form necessary *momenta*, or moving forces, in the process by which this idea is carried forward to its final completion; they can be studied accordingly, and understood, in the way, for instance, of comparative symbolism. But nothing of this sort can be affirmed of our reigning modern sects. No idea underlies them, by which they can be said to have a right to exist. Their appearance is in defiance and scorn of all such objective reason. It is their boast, to be sprung for the most part of mere private judgment and private

will. They start generally, by their own confession, in the most outward and accidental occasions. A Jacob Albright is awakened, and finding no congenial religious connections immediately at hand, makes his subjectivity the basis of a new sect, which in due time swells into an evangelical church. A John Winebrenner takes it into his head, that every body is wrong but himself, and being put out of the old church, complacently offers himself to the world as the nucleus of a new one, that may be expected to work better. Elder Randall is pushed aside by the Regular Baptists, and forthwith originates the Freewill Baptists. Mr. Cowherd (p. 124,) is led to inculcate the doctrine of abstinence from the flesh of animals, as well as total abstinence from all intoxicating liquors, "on the testimony of the Bible," and has many other private fancies besides on the same testimony; and so we get the *Bible Christian Church*; still happily in the wilderness and out of sight. Dr. Abner Jones, of Vermont, has "a peculiar travel of mind in relation to sectarian names and human creeds," and to rectify the evil sets in motion a sect of his own, which falls in afterwards with two other equally providential accidents, and helps in this way to form the body calling themselves "Christians." And so it goes, to the end of the chapter. Can anything well be more accidental and capricious, than the rise of sects in this way? Who does not see, that we might as reasonably have five hundred in such form, as fifty or sixty? Have there not been hundreds of men, who had just as much vocation in their circumstances as Albright or Winebrenner, to found new churches, that might have had just as much character and meaning too, as theirs, or possibly a good deal more? It is the easiest thing in the world to moot new questions in religion, scores of them, that might just as fully justify division as half of those that have already led to it, provided only the proper zeal were got up in some quarter to push them out to such extreme, "for conscience' sake," and to put honor on the Bible. Will any pretend to reduce such a system to any sort of intelligible method or scheme? It has none. It is supremely irrational, so far as all inward reason goes, by its very constitution. We might as well pretend to systematize and genealogize the clouds, driven hither and thither by all conflicting winds. It is a chaos, that excludes all science.

Who will dream here of a Sect Symbolism, generically unfolding the inward sense of each upstart body, as related to all the rest and to the whole system, its historical necessity, its complementary contribution to the full idea of Protestantism? Who will find it needful for the right understanding of theology, to pursue the history of its doctrines through the mazes of our present sectarianism, as held, for instance by the United Brethren, the Cumberland Presbyterians, and all manner of Baptists; in the same way that all true theology does require undoubtedly such a prosecution of doctrines, through the life of the ancient Greek Church, the life of the Roman Church, and that of the original Protestant Church under both its grand confessional distinctions. Take one wing only of the system, the Scotch Secession, which has been accustomed from the first to make the greatest account of its own *theological* significance, in this way; and what after all, we ask soberly, is the value of all its witnessings put together, in this country, for the cause of universal Christianity, whether in theory or practice? Is there any inward reason in its divisions and subdivisions, its abortive unions and consequent new sections, till the whole has become a tangled web in the end which it is a perfect weariness of the flesh to pretend to unravel? Altogether we have some ten or twelve bodies in this country, (possibly more,) conscience split for the glory of God, who stand unitedly, while severally excluding one another, not only on the Bible, the sure foundation of all sects, but on the Presbyterian sense of the Bible also as embodied in the Westminster Confession. *Can* there be any meaning or reason in such a phenomenon? Has historical theology any real interest whatever in the questions that lie between Old Covenanters, New Covenanters, Associate Seceders, Associate Reformed Seceders, and Reformed Associate Reformed Seceders, clear out to the tip end of orthodoxy in the last *wee* Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania? To ask the question, is to provoke a smile. Who understands this field of church history? Who cares to thrust himself into its briery waste? Do these sects understand themselves? Is there, in truth, anything in them *to be* understood; or that is likely to weigh a feather hereafter, under any separate view, in the mind of God's Universal Church? Alas, for the *unreason* of our reigning *sect* system!

2. The evil just noticed is greatly aggravated by the consideration, that very few sects remain *constant* at all to their own origin, or make it their business to understand and maintain them. If this change were the result of a true inward process, serving to develope the sense of some mission they had at first, it might be all very well; but every body may easily enough see, that this is not the case. The movement is altogether negative and outward, and amounts to nothing. Once formed, the body floats hither and thither according to circumstances, till finally its original moorings are lost sight of almost entirely; only it still carries its old name and has gradually accumulated a certain historical substance of its own, a body of recollections and traditions, shibboleths and hobbies, prejudices and pedantries; whereby all manner of selfish interests and ends are enlisted for its support, and room made for a few men in the saddle, by humoring its fancies, to rule and guide it almost at their pleasure. Thus the original irrationality of sects is made for the most part more irrational still, looses any little grain of reason it may have had at first, by the meaningless fluctuations of their subsequent history. The starters of a sect, fifty years afterwards, in many cases, would hardly recognize their own progeny. Happy is the sect, that is able to define at all its own distinctive position, or that can give any show of reason whatever for its existence, under such form as it actually carries. In the great majority of cases, this cannot be done even by the ministers themselves. And then as to the people, poor sheep in the hands of their leaders and pastors, what can *they* be expected to know of their own denominational "whereabouts," or of its rational necessity, in the general pell-mell of conflicting "persuasions" with which they are surrounded? As a general thing they know nothing about it.

3. The system is constitutionally *tyrannical*. Every sect pretends indeed to make men *free*. But only consider what sects are; self-constituted ecclesiastical organizations, called forth ordinarily by private judgment and caprice, and devoted to some onesided christian interest, under perhaps the most superficial and narrow view; educated polemically to a certain fanatical zeal for their own separatistic honor and credit; and bent on impressing their own "image and superscription," on all that fall be-

neath their ghostly power. Are these the circumstances that favor liberality and independence? The man who puts his conscience in the keeping of a sect, is no longer free. It might as well be in the keeping of a Roman priest. In many cases indeed this were far better. Have the Baptists no traditions? Is there no slavery of intellect and heart among the United Brethren? Pshaw! The very last place in which to look for true spiritual emancipation, the freedom of a divinely, self-poised catholic mind, is the communion of sects.

4. The narrowness and tyranny of the sect spirit, unfriendly to all generous christian life, is of fatal force in particular against the cultivation of *theology*, without which in the end it is not possible for the church to have any true prosperity. Theology can be no science, except as it has to do with the whole of Christianity, and is thus at once both churchly and historical in the full sense of these terms. The sect life, by its very conception, kills it, by turning it into a petrifaction or causing it to evaporate in the way of thin abstraction. Facts here are very plain. Sects, as they actually exist, have no theology, save as now mentioned; the miserable residuum only, so far as it may have any value at all, of the church life they had to start upon in the beginning, carried along with them as a mere outward tradition. Sects have no pleasure in theology, as a science. It has nothing to expect from this quarter. It is no libel on our American sects in particular, to say that they have not thus far contributed anything at all to the advance of this most noble and excellent of all sciences; and it needs no prophet's gift to say, that they never will do so in time to come. If any service has been rendered to it in any quarter, it has been by such as have been able to surmount the system in some measure, forcing their way upwards into a more catholic region. No sectarian theology can ever be of any permanent value.

5. The sect plague has no tendency to work out its own *cure*; unless it be in the way of a deadly malady, that ends itself by ending the life on which it has come to fasten. It is vain to look for a reduction of the number of sects, by their voluntary amalgamation. No two have yet been able to make themselves one. The difficulty is not in their theological differences. These

are for the most part of very little practical force ; with the great mass of the people, we may say, indeed, of absolutely no force at all. In nine cases out of ten it is a matter of sheer accident, that this man is an Albright and his neighbor a Cumberland Presbyterian, that one phase of the Baptist faith prevails here and another phase of it ten miles off. All this, however makes no matter ; and it would make very little matter, if it were brought to be never so clear that the causes of separation in any case had completely fallen away. There would still be no union. It is the curse of the system, that it can never of itself break the chains it has thus forged for its own slaves. On the contrary, it tends perpetually from bad to worse. It is easier by far to divide one sect into two, than it is to splice two sects into one. There is not the least reason to expect accordingly, that the system will ever reform itself into any better shape. It is plain moreover that it has no necessary end ; on the contrary, its capabilities and possibilities are indefinitely boundless. No multiplication of sects can exhaust the principle from which they spring.

6. It is well to note how generally the sect system adheres to the article of *justification by faith*, and how prone it is to run this side of Christianity out to a false extreme, either in the way of dead antinomianism or wild fanaticism. With many persons, at this time, the test of all soundness in religion is made to stand in the idea of salvation by grace as opposed to works, Christ's righteousness set over to our account in an outward way, and a corresponding experience more or less magical in the case of those who receive it, which goes under the name of evangelical conversion. But now it falls in precisely with the abstract mechanism of the sect mind, to throw itself mainly on this view of religion, to the exclusion or at least vast undervaluation of all that is comprised in the mystery of christianity as the power of a new creation historically at hand in the church. It is common for sects, accordingly, to make a parade of their zeal, in such style, for the doctrines of grace and the interests of vital godliness ; and this is often taken at once for a sufficient passport in their favor, as though any body of religionists professing faith in free justification and violent conversion, must needs be part and parcel of Christ's Church, however unchurchly in all other

respects. But surely for a sober mind, it should be enough to expose the fallacy of such thinking, to look over the array of sects which is here presented to our view, and see how easy it is for almost the whole of them, if need be, to legitimate their pretensions in this way. All fragments of the Scotch Secession of course are one here, however divided in their "testimonies" at other points. They make election the principle of christianity, turn justification by faith into a complete abstraction, and so nullify the law in one form, only to come too generally under the yoke of it again in another. The Baptists, through all their divisions, meet here also as on common ground ; with antinomian tendency in one direction ; with a tendency to fanaticism in another direction ; but with common intolerance, all round, to every view of religion that is not found to harmonize with their own abstract scheme. The Winebrennerians hold justification by faith without works, (p. 177,) and are great in their way for revivals and wholesale conversions. So of course the Albright Brethren (p. 277.) So the United Brethren in Christ (p. 564.) These and other sects indeed ambitiously strive to outdo one another, in the business of saving souls in the most approved style, "getting them through" as it is called, according to the abstract scheme now noticed. The one grand requisite for fellowship in the Campbellite communion is, (p. 225,) "an entire reliance upon the merits of Christ alone for justification ;" it is founded we are told, (p. 223,) "upon the two great distinguishing principles of the Lutheran Reformation, *viz*: the Bible alone as the rule of faith, to the entire exclusion of tradition, and the relying only upon that justification that is obtained through faith in Jesus Christ." Even the "Christians," with no faith in Christ's divinity, and the Universalists too, when it suits, can go in for some sort of abstract magical justification, and on the strength of it bring into play the common revival machinery with quite good success. All this surely deserves to be well laid to heart. There are, it is but too plain, "depths of Satan" here, as well as in other quarters, against which we need to stand solemnly on our guard. Let no one feel that it is safe to go with a sect, simply because it may seem to be *evangelical*, (O most abused word,) in this quacksalvery style. What can it be worth, if it be dissociated wholly from the old church consciousness embodied in the creed ?

7. For one who has come at all to understand the constitution of this abstract supernaturalism, it can produce no surprise to find the sect system marked universally by a *rationalistic* tendency. A Rationalism that denies the supernatural altogether, and a Supernaturalism that will not allow it to enter into any concrete union with the natural, are at bottom much of the same nature; and the last needs only the force of true consecutive thinking always, to pass over peacefully into the arms of the first. Sects start usually in abstract supernaturalism, with an affectation of hyper-spiritual perfection. But the rationalistic element comes at once into view, both in their thinking and practice. This is clearly exemplified in the Baptistic scheme, as already noticed; a divine statute book, outwardly certified to be from heaven; *christian laws* drawn forth from it in a like outward way; the mechanism of salvation brought nigh to men all outwardly again, in the form of thought or credited report; its application magically affected by an outward impulsion from God's Spirit, carrying the soul through a certain process of states and feelings. No sacramental grace. No true union with the life of Christ. So with sects generally. Their idea of private judgment; their notion of religious freedom; their low opinion of the sacraments; their indifference to all earnest theology; their propensity to drive religion by might and by power, rather than by the still small voice of God's Spirit; all betray a rationalistic habit of mind, and lean inwardly to still more decidedly rationalistic consequences and results. When Mr. Campbell makes Christianity to be "simply and solely," (p. 233,) the belief of certain testimony, and obedience to certain laws, outwardly offered to men in the Bible, what less is it, we ask, than the very genius of Rationalism itself; although most of the other sects probably would accept the same definition, as altogether satisfactory and sufficient. The sect life tends to destroy faith, as it is notoriously unfriendly also to every thing like reverence. It is not strange at all to see it running out into "Christianism;" or to hear, in certain quarters, of converts being taken into the church, (so called,) without baptism! There is too much reason to fear, that the virus of a low vulgar insensibility to the divine fact of Christianity has come to pervade the popular mind, in some sections of our country,

under the forms and shams of this unchurchly religionism far beyond what most persons have ever been led to imagine or suspect.

S. It is encouraging however, as well as curious, to see how the sect system is made to lend *testimony* throughout, against itself, to the idea of the Holy Catholic Church; not unlike the devils in the New Testament, who were forced to acknowledge Christ, while fighting against him or fleeing from his presence. Every sect, in spite of itself, is forced to acknowledge, at least indirectly, the necessary attributes of the Church, as one, holy, catholic, and apostolical. It cannot be a *mere* particular corporation, society or persuasion, however much in some views it may seem disposed to be nothing more. To stand at all, it must put on the character of a church, and then carry out as it best can what this character is felt by a sort of inward necessity, to imply and require. Some sects openly claim the prerogatives and powers of the Universal Church, as belonging to themselves alone, in such a way as to exclude all that is not of their own communion; and this certainly is the most consistent course. Generally however no such claim is made; but the sect professes to look upon itself only as a tribe of the true Israel, a section or wing in the sacramental host of God's elect. And yet it goes on, in these circumstances, to arrogate to itself within its own bounds full church powers; such powers as have no meaning, except as conditioned by the idea of a catholic or whole church; powers which cannot be fairly asserted, without virtual limitation upon the equal independence of sister sects. The inward ecclesiastical economy of every sect, as to its ordinations, admission of members, church censure, supervision of both faith and practice, &c., is so ordered as to involve throughout the assumption of an absolute and final and exclusive supremacy in matters of religion. The idea of the Church, however dimly and obscurely present, will not allow it to be otherwise. It *must* be one and universal, the *whole*, that of necessity excludes all beyond its own sphere. In this way every sect, so far as it can be called a church at all, becomes necessarily a caricature of the catholicity with which it pretends to make war, and so, like every other caricature, bears witness to the truth, which is thus distorted by it and brought into con-

tempt. In some cases, we have surprising confessions in favor of the true idea of the Church, where they might seem to be wholly out of place. Mr. Winebrenner (p. 175,) insists on visibility, unity, sanctity, universality and perpetuity, as the necessary attributes of the church. "An invisible church that some divines speak of," he tells us, "is altogether an anomaly in christian theology." So again: "The union of sects, into one general evangelical alliance, or into one human organization diverse in character, faith and practice, from the one true church of God, as characterized in the Bible, we have no belief in nor sympathy for." So we meet in Mr. Alexander Campbell many traces of a sound and right feeling here, which we may well regret to find overwhelmed again, and made of no effect, by the power of the unhistorical sect mind which is allowed after all to prevail in his system.

9. The posture of sects, being such as now described, involves them unavoidably in endless *inconsistency* and *contradiction*. There is a lie always at the bottom of it, from which it can never fully make its escape. It is the part pretending to be the whole, while it proclaims itself still to be nothing more than a part. The sect acknowledges the christian consciousness to be something deeper, more comprehensive, more absolutely necessary and real, than its own modification of it as a sect; and yet, this modification, the relative and partial sect consciousness, is in fact exalted above the other and clothed with powers which appertain of right only to the idea of christianity in full. The sect wills itself above the church, calls itself modestly *a church*, as one of many; but then goes on, almost in the same breath, to play itself off as *the church*, virtually sinking all other catholicity into a fiction as opposed to such high usurpation. Here is a tremendous contradiction, which runs through the entire system. The very features it is most ready to quarrel with in Romanism, it thrusts upon us again in new shape as its own. It hates church tradition; will hear of no binding force in church history; but straightway manufactures a log chain of authority in the very same form, out of the little yesterday of its own life, which it binds mercilessly on the neck of all its subjects. It will have no saints nor fathers; but forthwith offers us instead its own foun-

ders and leaders, and makes it well nigh blasphemy to speak a word in their dispraise. It is great for private judgment; which it takes mighty good care however to regulate, by bit and bridle, to one single track, and that generally of the most narrow sort. It is loud for the Bible, an open Bible, the Bible *alone*; but only as read through the medium of its own theological habit, and wo to the wight who may presume to read it in any other way. So throughout. The very things it protests and fights against in the church of Rome, it is ready the next moment to assert in its own favor, under some altered form; only with this difference that the old *catholic* truth which in every case underlies the Roman abuse, is with sects generally treated as part of that abuse itself, so that the new exercise of power brings no such sacred sanction along with it for the pious heart. It is counted dreadful that the church should be placed under the *human* headship of the pope, or of a pope and council; but has not every sect its human headship—whether one man, five men or twenty is of no account—whose supremacy is complete in all its religious affairs, only by its own confession *without* right divine? This headship, moreover, with all its pretended humility, is in no case slow to assume the exercise of divine powers. Popery, we are told with horror, presumes to fix doctrines, make laws, use keys &c., all in virtue of its own right and power, instead of simply following the letter of the Bible. And what sect, we ask, is not continually doing the same thing, in substantially the same way? Has not each sect its system of doctrines, or at least of notions, derived through its own prophetical headship, its particular founder and standing leaders, from the divine record, and legislated into authority by its own circle of reading and teaching, as absolutely as any faith that prevails in Rome? Has it not besides its *index expurgatorius* too, in fact if not in form, its particular world of religious thought hedged in carefully by its approved books and tracts, or possibly by a powerful “book establishment” even, that contrives to monopolize in great measure the business of thinking for the body at large? Rome, it is said, dares to create ecclesiastical rules, ceremonies, rites, &c. And what sect is it, that has not done the same thing? The Holy Church Catholic, by its very idea, includes in itself the whole power of the Saviour's

Mediatorial life, under its three functions, prophetical, priestly and kingly. To say that these functions are exercised by Christ only under an outward and separate form, and that the Church, his mystical Body, does not also include them in her constitution as "the fullness of him that filleth all in all," is a profound absurdity; an absurdity so profound indeed, that no religious body can assert it, and still claim to be a church, without at once falling into the most gross practical contradiction; that, namely, of repudiating the true powers of christianity in the only view in which they *are* true, and then trying to force them into its service again under another form that involves of necessity what is wrong and false. In claiming church rights and church powers accordingly, and in pretending to exercise church functions and satisfy church wants, every sect does in truth lay claim to a true prophetical, true priestly, and true kingly character, at the same time; as without all this, the other pretension is reduced to empty smoke. That is, every sect puts itself forward as an infallibly safe expositor of the true sense of Christianity and the Bible, a perfectly trustworthy and sufficient depository of God's grace and the sure medium of reconciliation with him for sinners, the legatee in full of the commission of the keys as originally given to Peter and his fellow apostles. And yet on the other hand, no such divine powers are acknowledged, as necessary at all to constitute the Church; and other sects are allowed to have just as much right to play prophet, priest and king, in the same ecclesiastical style, as the body in question; which at once turns all such exercise of church functions into a merely human assumption, resting on no general necessary ground whatever, that is, into the very essence of popery itself. In such perpetual self-contradiction is the sect system doomed everywhere to move, by trying to uphold the conception of the Church, while it shows itself at war with all the attributes that enter into its constitution.

Every sect, in claiming to be a church, claims rights and powers which it has no ability whatever, to make good, and invites a faith and trust for which it can offer no sort of commensurate ground in its actual constitution. Take, for exemplification, the large and respectable body of the Narraganset Brethren. Of its origin, tenets and ways, the case does not require that we should

speak. Enough that it rose in the way of protest against errors and defects which were supposed to prevail in the rest of the Christian world, threw itself on the sole guidance of the Bible, and has all along shown itself very zealous for evangelical religion and its own revivals. It allows now that there are other churches besides itself in the world ; that the sects generally, are such churches ; and is ready indeed, on fit occasion, to make a great parade of liberality and toleration, in the way of shaking hands with other denominations, to express what it conceives to be the "communion of saints." Still it puts itself forward, for all who can be induced to listen to its claims, as the comprehension in full of what the idea of the Church requires ; that is, it arrogates to itself prerogatives and resources, which are absolutely universal in their nature, and as such exclusive of every like claim in any other quarter. The sect calls on all men, as they value their salvation, to take refuge in her communion. She does not simply offer them the Bible, but along with it her own tradition also, her sacraments, her ministrations of grace. She is not content to make them christians, but seeks to make them also Narragansets. Her mission is to spread and build up Narragansetism. This for her is identical with absolute and complete Christianity ; she expects the whole world to become Narragansets, if not before, at least in the blessed millenium. This same feeling she tries to infuse into every soul, that falls within the range of her ecclesiastical domain ; and she exacts from them accordingly, at the same time, full faith in her separate sufficiency for all church purposes and ends. She assumes in regard to them the full stewardship of Christ's house. She makes herself responsible for their souls, engaging if they do but trust her guidance and care to see them safe into heaven. She carries the keys of the kingdom of heaven, to bind and to loose, to open and shut, at her own pleasure. All this implies *universal* validity in her acts, validity for all men and not simply for some men ; and in no other view can it ever be the object of Christian faith and trust. But see now the contradiction of the whole case. Narragansetism does not pretend to assert these universal powers in a truly universal way, but only within a given circle, the compass namely of her own membership. It is the church, with all its divine

resources, for one man who has got into its communion, but not at all for another, his neighbor, who belongs to another communion. It is charged with the salvation of one it may be in a family, where all the rest are cared for in a wholly different way. It exacts a faith and obedience of one, which it never thinks of requiring in the case of another. It calls for sacrifices and services in the first case, all for the glory of God in the promotion of Narragansetism, which it never dreams of demanding or exacting in the second. Its privileges and opportunities are for Narragansets only, not for Christians generally, save as they are willing to put on the Narraganset livery, and so make this to be identical with the profession of Christ. The censures of the sect too are taken by herself to be of universal force for those on whom they fall ; although acknowledged to be of no force whatever, should it be pretended to hurl them over the sect fence, into any part of the Christian world that lies beyond. Thus one man is excommunicated, put out of the whole church, by a power which would be only laughed at if it undertook to disturb in the least the ecclesiastical relations of another, close beside him, only within another communion, involved in precisely the same offence. Nay, the man who is thus amenable to Narraganset jurisdiction to day, may to-morrow clear himself of it completely by taking letters of dismission from his sect, with all its universal powers, and passing over to the jurisdiction of some other evangelical body, which exercises the same universal powers, with equal independence, in like circumscribed and particularistic style.

How *can* church powers carry with them any truly necessary and universal force, such as all church faith is felt to demand, exercised in this arbitrary and conventional way ? Plainly, in this whole order of things, the church has no necessary existence whatever, but is the creature and product simply of the men who belong to it, with such powers as they may be pleased to lodge in it for present use. There is a sore contradiction here in our whole sect system, the thorn of which those only can fail to feel sharply, who have never yet been brought earnestly to reflect on the true nature of the Church itself. No wonder that sects find it hard often to distinguish themselves from mere voluntary societies, in the service of morality and religion. No wonder, that their sacraments sink so

readily into rationalistic signs, and that the assertion of supernatural objective powers, as something immanent in the constitution of the Church itself, is apt to fill them with offence. It is hard indeed to conceive of all this in the communion of a sect, which I am at full liberty to forsake to morrow, if I so please, for the communion of another. How can I yield to such a body ever, as such, the faith and homage that are due to the Church as a divine reality, and which crave the presence of this Church in full as a necessary object, to make room for their exercise ? If I may thus leave one sect, why not twenty ; and if twenty, why not all ? On what principle of common sense am I bound to confine my ecclesiastical vagrancy to the range of actually existing sects, (accidents as they are too generally at best,) instead of bidding adieu at once to the whole of them, and originating a new communion, more to my taste, in the bosom say of my own house ? To all such questions the sect system can make no satisfactory reply. It tends, with inward necessity from the beginning, to subvert completely the whole idea of the Church.

10. It is owing in part at least, no doubt, to the vast inward lie which the sect system thus carries in its very constitution, that its influence is found to be so *unfavorable actually to honesty and godly sincerity*, in the case of those who surrender themselves to its power. This is a wide subject, which we will not pretend here to take up in its details. All experience however shows, that the sect mind, as such, has a strange tendency to run into low cunning, disingenuous trickery and jesuitic policy. Religion degenerates with it into a trade, in which men come to terms with God on the subject of their own salvation, and lay away their spiritual acquisitions as a sort of outward property for convenient use. The object is required to bend and bow to the subject ; becomes a thing indeed for private appropriation, and under such partial apprehension is made to stand falsely for what is the whole. Sect piety is constitutionally unequal, inconsistent, fantastic and pedantic. It never has been, and never can be, sound, calm, full, catholic and free. By the very falsehood of substituting the sect for the Church, it is involved necessarily in hypocrisy, which reaches always with fearful power at last into its entire life. It has a tendency universally to run into sham.

It abounds notoriously in cant. It is full of hollow pretensions, phrases and forms that have parted with all life. It delights in all sorts of quackery. Nor is this dishonesty confined to the sphere of religion ; it is very apt to infect the whole life. Hypocrisy towards God begets naturally unfaithfulness towards men. It is not meant of course to charge all sectarian christianity with the moral defect now noticed. We speak only of the *tendency* it has this way. Good men, in the bosom of a sect, may rise superior to the danger ; but in doing so, they lay aside to the same extent the sect consciousness itself, and are brought into conflict thus with its ordinary pretensions and claims. On all sides, however, we have examples enough of the bad power, which belongs to the system in the general view here presented. This book of sects sheds no small amount of illustration on their habit of carnal policy and jesuitic calculation. Still wider evidence of it is to be found every day, in our common sectarian religious press. What sectarian paper is trusted beyond the limits of its own denomination, on any question involving sectarian interests and relations? It seems almost the necessary character of every such publication, to be disingenuous and unfair ; without thought, it may be, or premeditation ; which itself, however, serves only the more fully to show how completely natural such want of catholic integrity is, for the whole system out of which it so easily and readily springs.

11. It is truly amazing, that any person should pretend to justify the sect system, as either agreeable to the true idea of Christianity or conducive to its interests. Some, however, still do so openly ; while a much larger number would seem to acquiesce in the thought, indirectly, at least, and by implication. Every such imagination, however, is itself, but a sign and proof of the evil nature of the system, for which it thus seeks to raise an apology ; for it carries in itself, we may say, the principle of annihilation in the end, for all that is comprehended in the faith of the holy catholic church. Not only is our sect system in flat contradiction to the letter of the New Testament ; it is at war besides with the divine constitution of Christianity itself. It wrongs the idea of the Church, withdraws it as an object of faith from the Christian world, and in this way mars and spoils the symmetry, and full-

ness, and force, of the Christian life throughout. The bad fruits of the system, in this view, stare us in the face from all sides. Our theology is sickly, lame and lean. Our piety is angular and hard, running much into narrow technicalities and traditionary forms. Every denomination has its own small world of theory and experience, which it affects to regard as universal Christianity, without the least account of the other little worlds of like sort, with which it is surrounded. It is gross falsehood, to say that the influence of sects on one another is wholesome, and favorable to the general cause of Christianity. Their emulation is not holy; and any gain that may seem to come of it, is no better than "the hire of a whore or the price of a dog" brought into the house of the Lord, which he has declared to be an abomination in his sight (Deut. xxiii. 18). It is not by any such rivalry and strife, that the glorious gospel may be expected to prevail in the world. All zeal for religion is rotten, and will be found at last to stink, that springs not from a true interest in religion for its own sake. Our sects do not love each other. Their relation to each other, at best, is one of indifference. To a fearful extent, it is one of quiet malignity and hatred. What sect takes any active interest in the welfare of another, rejoices in its prosperity, sympathizes with its griefs and trials, makes common cause with it in its enterprises and works? Every body knows, rather, that the charity of sects stops short for the most part with the lines of circumvallation that surround for each one its own camp, and that it is cold as winter towards all that lies beyond. The jealousies and collisions of sects, not loud, mainly, but in the form rather, of quiet still fanaticism, are the source of endless religious mischief throughout the land. Altogether the system is a plague that calls for mourning and lamentation in every direction.

12. For one who has come to make earnest with the church question, and who has courage to face things as they are in the way of steady firm thought, the whole present state of sect christianity is full of *difficulty and discouragement*. In the first place, it is not possible for him to identify any one sect with the idea of the whole Church. Whether he be a Methodist, or a Presbyterian, or a Lutheran, or of any other denomination, he sees clearly that it is a desperate business to think of making out a full agree-

ment with primitive christianity in favor of his own body. He owns too, at any rate that other bodies are included in the Church, as it now stands. Of course, his own is but a part of the Church, not numerically only, but also constitutionally. Hence it must be regarded, when taken by itself, as a one-sided and defective manifestation of the Christian life; and so the consciousness, or state of mind, which it serves to produce, and in which distinctively it stands, can never be rested in as evangelically complete. It is not possible thus for a true church consciousness, and the particular sect consciousness, Presbyterianism, Lutheranism, or any other, to fall together as commensurate spheres of life; the first is something far more wide and deep than the second, and cannot be asked to yield to this as ultimate in any way, without the sense of incongruity and contradiction. Then again, it becomes impossible, of course, to acquiesce in the denominational position as final and conclusive. No position can be so regarded, that is not felt to be identical with the absolute idea of Christianity, the true sense of it as a whole. What earnest minded man now seriously expects that his particular denomination, Methodist, Presbyterian, or any other, is destined to swallow up at last all other types of Christianity, and so rule the universal world? Nor is the case relieved at all, by imagining the different sects, as they now stand, to continue collectively in permanent force. It is not possible at all for a truly thoughtful spirit, to settle itself in this as the legitimate and normal state of the Church. The very sense of sect, as related to the sense of the Church, requires that the first should pass away. The whole sect system then is interimistic, and can be rightly endured only as it is regarded in this light. And yet the system itself is opposed to every such thought. It cannot will its own destruction. Every sect demands of its members a faith and trust, as we have already seen, which imply that it is to be taken as absolute and perpetual. It plays, in its place, the part of Christ's one universal Church. Here, then, is a difficulty. To cleave to the sect as an ultimate interest, in the way it requires, is to be divorced in spirit necessarily, to the same extent, from the true idea of Christ's kingdom, whose perfect coming cannot possibly be in such form. To become catholic, on the other hand, is necessarily to rise above the standpoint

of the mere sect, and to lose the power thus of that devotion to its interests, separately considered, which it can never fail to exact notwithstanding, as the test and measure, in such relation, even, of universal Christianity itself. How much of embarrassment and confusion is involved in all this, the more especially as the sect system has no tendency whatever to surmount its own contradiction, but carries in itself the principle only of endless disintegration, many are made to feel at this time beyond what they are well able to express.

J. W. N.

---

#### ART. XL.—UNIVERSAL HISTORY—ANTEHISTORIC PERIOD— THE CHINESE.

[In the last number of the Review was published the introduction to a Manual of Universal History, originally prepared for the use of Marshall College, by the Rev. Mr. Mann, of Philadelphia, and designed to be used as a text-book in that Institution. It contains a general outline of the principles which are illustrated in detail in the succeeding parts of the work. The introduction itself cannot be fully understood unless studied in connection with the historical facts narrated in the history of the different nations treated of. No final sentence, either of praise or dispraise, can be justly passed upon its merits, before an opportunity may be afforded for the perusal of the entire Manual.

The history itself is divided into three grand divisions: 1. The Antehistoric period; 2. The most important nations before the birth of Christ; 3. The most important nations after the birth of Christ. Under these leading divisions are arranged, in systematic order, the several nations, ancient and modern, which have in any way contributed to the progress of society towards its final end. As Christ himself is regarded as the centre of the world, ancient history must be considered as a preparation, in all its parts, for the great mystery of the Incarnation; and modern, as an expansion of it. In the department of Ancient History, great pains are taken to show how the political, social, artistic, and scientific activity of the human family, in its final tendencies, strove to effect a lasting union between God and man,

but without success. Still, as struggles after emancipation from the thraldom of sin and the attainment of spiritual freedom, they must not be regarded as void of meaning. They demonstrate, beyond the possibility of contradiction, that our common human nature, in consequence of its original constitution, hungers and thirsts after a living union and communion with the fountain of Light and Life, with the Great God himself. Such a union, however, could not have been accomplished in a sudden, abrupt way. In accordance with the law of our life, which is a law of progressive growth, history moves forward through a period of 4000 years before the Incarnation—that greatest of all facts—took place. When now men had been prepared for his reception by a systematic course of education, conducted by Providence, in conjunction with human agencies, the Word became Flesh. The new life thus introduced into the very heart of the world, constitutes the governing principle of Modern History; and it is the business of the historian to point out the influence which it exerted on society at large.

That the readers of the Review may be enabled to obtain a clearer conception of the character of this Manual, it has been thought proper to continue the publication of extracts from it.]

#### PART 1. *The Ante-historic Period.*

§ 1. A cloud of impenetrable darkness overshadows the primitive state of man. Neither Sacred nor Profane History furnishes us sufficient and authentic materials for the formation of clear and definite opinions concerning the condition and character of the earliest society. This uncertainty arises not only from the absence of proper data and the meagreness of the chronicles we may possess, but springs immediately out of the idea of history itself. In nature the ripest bloom of vegetation and the richest fullness of the most beautiful forms of its existence, are preceded by a state of chaotic confusion, when the elemental powers are struggling in the birththroes of creation. In the idea of life is implied a progressive advance from lower to higher stages of perfection. Its beginnings, involved in a process of formation, escape the ken of the acutest observer, and successfully defy detection. In the department of nature, order succeeds to disorder, light to darkness, beauty to deformity.

Nor does this law of life terminate its activity within the narrow bounds of nature; it displays its presence in a higher form, in the province of human existence. But history is the summary of the various manifestations of mind, as they have been successively revealed at different periods, in the onward march of time. As, therefore, the beginning of our common human life lies hid from common observation, and becomes visible only after it has attained to a

certain point in its growth, so in history, its earliest appearances are not characterized by any distinctive features. It is only after man has advanced to a certain position in the scale of civilization, that the certainty of history increases and its materials become authentic.

§ 2. According to the Scripture account, He who in the beginning created the heavens and the earth, made man in his own image, surrounded him with Paradisaic happiness, and invested him with sovereign authority over the inferior orders of creation. It is impossible to determine with precise accuracy the locality of the beautiful garden of Eden—the blooming cradle of our first parents, and the gloomy sepulchre of their pristine innocence. Nor can any adequate solution be given to the question which on the very vestibule of history enforces its claims upon our attention, how the human race which, according to the Biblical narrative, sprung from the same stock, could have branched out into so many distinct families, differing from each other in color, in physical organization, and in mental and spiritual endowments.

In opposition to the Pantheistic cosmological speculations of heathen antiquity, which either ascribed to matter an eternal co-existence with God himself, or regarded it as a voluntary emanation of his being, the Bible teaches that the world sprang into existence out of nothing, at the command of Jehovah, whose good pleasure it was, in this way, to reveal his Omnipotence, his Wisdom, and his Love.

Various theories have been advanced respecting the abode of our first parents. The simple fact that Mesopotamia was rendered fruitful by artificial irrigation, overthrows the hypothesis which assigns it to that country. Others bestow this honor upon Canaan, because it abounds the whole year round in palatable fruits. Numerous arguments tend to prove, that the elevated but warm and lovely Cashmere, enjoyed the privilege of nourishing our progenitors. Vide 1 M. ii., 8, 10-14.

All profound philosophers, who have made man the subject of their special study, acknowledge with one accord that the differences of color and of mind which characterize the several races, spring not so much from the influence of climate and the gradual deterioration effected by unnatural intermarriages, and other causes, as from the operation of immoral principles introduced into our nature by the Fall. This diversity consists not only in the variety of color and of size, in the formation of the skull and in the physical appearance generally, but principally and mainly, in the relative

strength of the mental capacities and in the intensity of self consciousness. Still, with this difference in full view, it would be both unphilosophical and unscriptural to uphold the theory of a *specific* distinction in the various branches of the human family, and to deny the biblical account of the unity of its origin. Most recent physiological and philological investigations prove, beyond the possibility of doubt, that, whilst the races differ from each other in certain leading characteristics, they coincide so far as to justify us in referring them all to a common origin. They may be most conveniently divided into three distinct stems: the Ethiopian or Negro, which, considering its general character, may be compared to the darkness of night, the Mongol, to the faint light of dawn, and the Caucasian, to the full blaze of day. The Malays, Hottentots, Indians, &c., whose influence upon the progress of society has been very trifling, are to be regarded rather as degenerate branches of races than independent races themselves.

§ 3. From the Bible and numerous traditional legends of various nations geographically separated, this much may be gathered with absolute certainty: our first parents lived in a state of happy innocence, which was destroyed by sin; in consequence of this defection, they were driven out of the garden of Eden, and compelled to eat their bread in the sweat of their brow; with their multiplication and distribution over the earth, arose the distinction of races and tribes; the character of their descendants was gradually improved by the art of working in metals, by the practise of agriculture, by a gradual acquaintance with the powers of nature, and by the purifying influence of their religion, which was divinely appointed to teach them their dependance upon Him whose law they had violated.

To give a minute description of the peculiar privileges our first parents enjoyed in Paradise, does not fall within the province of Universal History. Still, it may not be improper to mention, that the biblical account concerning the character of Adam, cannot be referred to any intellectual superiority, but to the purity of his heart and the possession of inward peace with his Maker.

As regards the creation of woman, it is worthy of remark, that whilst the Bible recognized a decided difference between the sexes in physical organization, in mental and moral capacities, it also teaches that this diversity is a necessary condition for their proper union. Among the nations which flourished before the time of

Christ, females were not honored with the respect they justly deserve, but lived either in a state of absolute slavery, or shared the affections of their husbands with jealous rivals. But the rights and dignity of woman were clothed with imperishable glory by the great fact of the incarnation, and enforced upon the attention of men by the doctrines inculcated by the son of David.

According to 1 M ii. 15, the happiness of our first parents did not consist in inglorious ease, or sluggish torpidity. Within the inclosure of their celestial home, in meek submission to the will of God, they performed their appointed work without experiencing the sharp pangs of sorrow; in strains of heavenly eloquence they pronounced His high praises, uninterrupted by the wild jargon of discord. But their glory was withered by the poisonous blast of sin; the harmony of their souls was disordered, and death introduced into every department of the universe.

As man put forth his activities in a period when it was impossible to collect historical material and transmit it in writing to posterity, the numerous attempts to trace with distinct accuracy the progress of our race from its original condition, from the state of the hunter, of the fisherman, of the shepherd, to the formation of the first kingdoms, have never been crowned with complete success. In the Bible we have some satisfactory hints recorded. vide 1 M. 4. God did not permit man to run on in a course of sin without throwing in his path some obstructions; in the exercise of the most watchful solicitude, He endeavored to awaken him to a knowledge of his misery and to an intense longing after the promised Messiah, 1 M. iii. 15.

§ 4. As the deluge swept into oblivion the productions of human industry during this obscure period, it is neither necessary nor important to ascertain the precise extent of its duration. After the flood, we find the survivors of the race at Mt. Ararat, on the high table land between the Black and Caspian seas.

That this awful catastrophe which caused the destruction of nearly the whole human family really occurred, has been abundantly proved, apart from the veracity of the Bible, by the traditional records of ancient nations. Humboldt discovered clear intimations concerning some vast flood of waters that overwhelmed the earth in ruin, in the legends of Central America.

Whatever conjectures we may entertain concerning the physical appearance of the antediluvian world—and beyond mere conjecture

we cannot go, because the flood extinguished all the manners customs, arts, sciences of this early period—we are compelled to admit without any clear historical evidence, as a necessary result of the laws of nature, that the surface of the earth was materially changed by the desolation occasioned by the deluge.

§ 5. The sacred writings attribute the repopulation of the world to the activity of Noah's three sons. From Mt. Ararat, as a starting point, they spread in different directions; the descendants of Shem settled in the southern and eastern part of Asia; of Ham, in the south-western, and in the neighborhood of the Nile; of Japhet, in the north-western part of Asia, and in Europe.

In a branch of Shem's family, was preserved the knowledge of the true God. In 1 M. ix. 27, is recorded a prophecy of the future historical importance of Japhet's descendants, who in the course of time became the monarchs of the world, and were first made acquainted with the economy of the Gospel.

With the dispersion of nations, whilst they were engaged in building the tower of Babel, language, which had hitherto preserved its unity, fell into a state of interminable confusion. A multitude of tongues, distinguished from each other by essential differences, but proving their common origin by many points of similarity, spread over the earth. In the Indo-Germanic family formed by the sons of Japhet, are included the Indian, the Greek, the Latin, the German, the Sclavonic, together with their cognate languages. This family occupies an extensive tract of country; it reaches from the extreme south of India to Iceland, in the north-western part of Europe, and bids fair to take full possession of America. The Shemites gave birth to the Chaldaic, the Syriac, the Hebrew, the Arabic, together with their kindred tongues; the Hamites, to the Caananitic, the Mongolian, the Ethiopian, and all the languages of Africa.

§ 6. Historical and geographical facts furnish convincing proof, that the physical, intellectual and moral culture of any race depends, more or less, upon the outward configuration of the country in which it has settled. In the formation of human character, two influences are continually operative. Man as spirit, stands in the closest connection with the invisible world, and is exposed to its hallowed influences; as body, he is bound to the earth and subject to changes effected by temperature of climate, diversity of surface, beauty of scenery. But as body and soul are only different phases of one life, and reciprocally influence each other, it is clear that the internal

structure of man may be modified by the outward forces of nature.

Thus it is that in fruitful plains and well watered valleys, where agriculture reaches its perfection, a tranquil and peacable life prevails; in deserts and steppes, which induce a roaming habit, a pastoral life; in mountainous districts, which compel its inhabitants to obtain subsistence by hunting, a warlike and predatory disposition is engendered. The inhabitants of commodious seacoasts, who may be called the mediators between distant countries, imbibe a strong attachment to commerce and navigation; whilst the immigrant cast upon barren and inhospitable shores, who consumes his energies in endeavoring to secure a scanty livelihood by fishing, forms a hardy and robust character in continual conflict with the tumultuous elements of nature.

§ 7. The apostacy of man from God, was an apostacy from his own original dignity. Having lost the knowledge of his previous superiority over all the works of nature, and laboring with systematic zeal to efface the remembrance of his obligations to his Maker, he gave to the finite creature the worship due alone to the infinite Creator, attributed to natural powers sanctifying influences, and effectually precluded, in this way, the possibility of redemption from the curse of sin.

The three original races, however, were not involved to the same extent in the moral obliquity which characterized the heathen world generally. The descendants of Japhet, terrified by the magnificent appearances of nature, sought their protection by invoking their assistance. Captivated by the surpassing beauty of the human form and the vigor of the human intellect, they divested their gods of supernatural attributes and degraded them to the level of mere human beings. The sons of Ham whose understanding had been darkened by the worship of animals, degenerated into a miserable Feticism and clothed the idea of a supreme power with a gloomy, diabolical character. The Shemites alone, one branch of which race retained a faint remembrance of the true God, recognized in the majestic course of the planets and their brilliancy, proofs of Divine power and wisdom.

§ 8. As we are not able to determine precisely the duration of the ante-historic period, we cannot point out the particular time when it terminated. If we date the creation of the world in round numbers from 4000 A. C., the deluge happened, according to Scripture chronology, 2350 A. C.

We cannot regard as authentic sources of information, the chronological tables and genealogies in the possession of some oriental nations which have elaborated a claim to the remotest antiquity by the successive accumulation of thousands upon thousands of years. Such an incongruous and unwarrantable connection of immense periods of time, always betrays a shallow conception of history, and arises not infrequently from a very inaccurate knowledge of the significance of historical events, and a vain desire on the part of a nation to increase its claims to respect by putting on the venerable garb of old age.

§. 9. The proper sphere of history, as distinguished from the unsatisfactory accounts of the ante-historic period, begins with the time when single kingdoms assume a fixed, definite form, when the sources of information commend themselves to our notice by the certainty of their character, and are no longer accompanied with a host of fables and marvellous stories.

The primitive form of human society is the Patriarchal, in which the members of a family are subordinated to the control of the father, who presides over its interests by a kind of natural right. But this simple form of life could not always maintain its authority. In the course of time, it was succeeded by the formation of tribes or clans. These contractions, alliances for the purpose of resisting the encroachments of ambitious patriarchs, gradually enlarged the limits of government and prepared the way for the rise of independent kingdoms. With the patriarchal, or nomadic state, however, the proper sphere of history, strictly speaking, does not commence. The permanent settlement of an agricultural people in a country according with their mode of life, necessarily and imperceptibly occasioned the enactment of laws, of ordinances, and of treaties. As man advanced in the scale of civilization, new relations sprung into being which required either an improvement of previously existing laws, or the introduction of new ones. Thus, in the course of time, and in entire accordance with the natural growth of society, there arose the different occupations of life, as agriculture, hunting, &c., together with the various classes of men as hunters, shepherds, farmers, tradesmen, warriors, priests, &c., who filled these several stations. At the head of these different orders stood a particular cast, which exercised a kind of sovereign power.

\* \* \* \* \*  
PART II.—A.—*The Chinese.*§ 11. *Geographical Outline.*

FROM the eastern and southern terminations of the high table-land which covers Central Asia, the empire of China, containing, according to the most recent computation, a population of two hundred millions of souls, stretches its immense surface southward to India, and to the Pacific ocean on the east. China proper, which here claims our attention particularly, is separated from the other countries of Asia by vast chains of mountains and uncultivated steppes, and from the rest of the world by tempestuous seas. Down from its principal western mountains, stream two mighty rivers, the Hoang Ho and the Tang tse Kiang. The country which these waters traverse, presents a soil of unparalleled fertility. The mountains of China abound in metals; it is richly provided with every species of animals and plants.

§ 12. *Influence of these Geographical Relations.*

This planet which is so admirably adapted for the residence of intelligent creatures, is the divinely appointed hall in which an intellectual and moral race are to receive their education.

In the formation of individual and national character, and in the progress of civilization, two elements perfectly distinct, but in their action reciprocal, are continually at work. As above remarked, the peculiar configuration of continents and the geographical position of particular countries, with their mountains and valleys, their lakes and rivers, exert a controlling influence on the people who inhabit them. Mere outward circumstances, however, would be insufficient to give a distinctive direction to the activities of any nation, if there were at hand no peculiar mental and spiritual constitution upon which they could operate. In passing judgment upon the character of any people, the historian must not only recognize the influence which geographical circumstances exert, but must also describe the peculiar spiritual constitution with which Providence has endowed them.

As respects China, the impress of its peculiar situation is clearly discernible. Its geographically isolated position, and the rich fertility of its soil, excite in the Chinese a feeling of self dependance and a spirit of national vanity, which causes them to treat all foreigners as barbarians. But man is formed for society; his nature

can never be fully unfolded except as he cultivates domestic and international relations. On this account it is that the Chinese, who began and carried forward, to some extent, the work of civilization, never succeeded either in unfolding their natural resources, or in advancing the general interests of society.

### § 13. *History of China.*

Next to the Hebrews, the Chinese, a branch of the Mongol race, lay claim to a prodigious antiquity. Without pretending to discuss the justice or injustice of their claims, which have been ably defended by some historians, and as ably assailed by others, we will date the commencement of the Chinese empire, 3082 B. C.; though we are not prepared to furnish satisfactory reasons for selecting this particular time. On account of the monotonous uniformity which characterizes its history and its complete isolation from the rest of the world, and in order to preclude the necessity of returning to its consideration, we will delineate its history from the earliest times to the present day.

The ancestors of the Chinese, like those of all other Asiatic nations, are supposed to have descended from the neighboring mountains of central Asia. In their governmental relations, they allow themselves to be called by no national name, but sometimes assume the names of their emperors. So extravagant is their vanity, that they imagine their country occupies the centre of the globe, and proudly dignify themselves with appellations such as "the Celestial Empire, the Middle Kingdom," &c.

Their oldest rulers discharged the functions both of teachers and lawgivers. Of these Fu Hi and Chai Mung, who are supposed to have instructed the earliest inhabitants in agriculture, in the manufacture of silk, in writing and other useful arts, were honored with peculiar respect. Soon after their death, the method of computing time by divisions of sixty years' duration, was introduced.

Tü, the Great, (2297 B. C.) before whose accession to the throne an elective form of government was practised, divided the kingdom into nine provinces, and ordered charts of them to be engraved on iron plates. His immediate successors, who were neither possessed of his political abilities, nor favored by the good fortune which generally attended his plans, exposed the empire to foreign invasions by their impolitic measures, and brought destruction upon his dynasty by their weakness, 1766 B. C. From this period down to the pre-

sent time, the government of China was successively conducted by twenty-one dynasties.

From the earliest times onward through the entire period of its existence, three influences, in their operation exceedingly injurious, retarded the prosperity of China and checked its growth. The gross licentiousness and oppressive cruelty of some of its rulers, destroyed the moral sense of the people by encouraging the indulgence of unbridled passion; the feudal system which had been framed and put into operation by the energetic Mu Mang, broke the unity of the empire by increasing beyond lawful bounds the rights and privileges of individual kings: to complete the disorder, the fierce Tartars rushed from their original abodes, and devastated the country they had unlawfully invaded.

During the third dynasty, (1122-249 B. C.) flourished the two most profound philosophers of China, La Riam and Confucius. But their scientific investigations had no power to relieve their country from the heavy load of misery which now afflicted it. Even Confucius, though worthy of our admiration as a teacher of morals and a preserver of peace in a kingdom distracted by internal dissensions, could not move the immobility of the Chinese by the vigor of his thoughts, nor purge the immorality of their conduct by the pure precepts of his ethical system, nor rectify the disorders of their government by his representation of filial piety as the root of all virtue, and the sure guaranty of good citizenship. During the fourth dynasty, (246-210,) which witnessed the erection of the Great Wall as a defence against the destructive invasions of the northern Tartars, the empire rose to a height of prosperity and glory hitherto unattained. This period of political renown was followed in the fifth dynasty, by an extensive and successful cultivation of the sciences. The historian Scema dispelled the ignorance of the age by his learned researches; the old canonical books known by the name of Ring, were collected and formed into a system; the art of printing, not with moveable types, but from blocks of wood, with characters carved in the manner of sculpture, was invented.

The progress of Chinese civilization thus auspiciously commenced, was interrupted by the rise of civil dissensions, which again desolated the country with fearful ruin, and gave occasion for the inroads of the Topa Tartars, who conquered the greatest portion of China. In the southern provinces, which happily escaped the grasp of these invaders, the eighth dynasty was founded by Song, 420 A. D.

These civil feuds continued during the century immediately following. An account of them would be neither interesting nor profitable. A more terrible storm which had been gathering its strength many years before its appearance, poured its wrath upon the unfortunate Chinese. In the first part of the thirteenth century, the Mongols, under the celebrated Yinges Khan, invaded the empire, subverted the government, and compelled them to submit to the yoke of a foreign dynasty. But the destruction of their political independance did not in the least change their peculiar national character. With an obstinate stubbornness which the severest penalties could not abate, they clung to the customs of their fathers and even induced their conquerors to adopt their laws and institutions. Pekin became the capital of the empire, and the erection of the Great Imperial canal commenced 1280 A. D.

The rule of the Mongols was of short duration. They were compelled to evacuate the country in the year 1368, by the outbreak of a revolution occasioned by a priest, who formed the resolution to deliver his countrymen from the oppression of their invaders. Soon after, 1616, the Mantchew Tartars advanced to the frontiers of China, and declared that they had been summoned by a Divine call to subjugate the country. After a series of fiercely contested battles, they succeeded in establishing their own government, and founded the twenty-second, or Tai Tsin dynasty, which still has undisputed possession of the throne. Various attempts have been made, particularly by Jesuit missionaries of the Roman Catholic Church, to bring the Chinese under the influence of the Gospel, but their obstinate adherence to old customs, and hatred to all innovations, have rendered all such laudable efforts unsuccessful. Very recently, however, the gates of the celestial empire, for so long a time closed against the inhabitants of the western world, have been unbarred; the thunder of the English cannon before the walls of Canton, may prove to have been the precursor of the final triumph of Christianity over a godless heathenism.

The name of the present emperor is Tao Kwang. He commenced his reign 1821.

The most extensive work on Chinese history, is the *Historie générale de la Chine*, par Mailla. He continues the history to the year 1736, A. D.

### § 14. *The Character of the Chinese in general.*

Though inferior to the Mongolian and Tartar nations in courage and bodily strength, the Chinese, who are members of the same race, possess good natural endowments. The ingenuity and inventive character of their mind preserves them from falling into a state of stupid indifference; their love of order in the various relations of life, tends to the cultivation of taste; their industry promotes at least the physical welfare of the country, while the cool, calculating judgment which directs their conduct, restrains them from the commission of impolitic actions. Their complete isolation from the civilizing influences of the world at large, and the proud consciousness of being dependant alone upon their own resources for the necessities of life, have not only inspired them with a fixed aversion to the introduction of every foreign element, and incapacitated them for examining impartially the productions of other nations and acknowledging their decided superiority, but have also effectually retarded their own progress in civilization. Their history, in this respect, furnishes clear proof that no nation, how brilliant soever its natural capacities may be, can make continuous advances in the proper cultivation of its own resources, except as it enters into living communion with surrounding nations. Providence in his wisdom has so arranged the various departments of society, that its perfection depends upon the extent of their mutual influence.

The constitutional defect in Chinese character, is an overbearing vanity which looks down upon the world with supreme contempt, and regards its inhabitants as uncultivated barbarians. Believing that no advance can be made beyond the science and art of their ancestors, the Chinese are disposed to consider the mental productions of other nations as unwarrantable innovations, which only deserve the ridicule of all great and good men. No one dare presume to be wiser than their fathers were. But this sweeping judgment, if reversed, will accord better with the facts of history and approach nearer to the truth. Their childish predilection for everything which bears the impress of antiquity, may call forth a smile for their folly and provoke our wrath at the obstinacy with which they endeavor to check the onward march of history. Their sensibility is rather blunt; their imaginative powers very weak; all is the product of cold reason. They are influenced neither by the stirrings of a laudable enthusiasm, nor by a spirit of active enterprize; in the regular discharge of the ordinary duties of life, they are content to live

without ever attempting to ameliorate their condition: like little children, they find most delight in games and plays, in gewgaws and gilded puppets.

From the earliest period on record, such has been the character of the Chinese; nor have they ever succeeded in advancing from this contracted state to a higher and more ennobling condition. Their violation of the wholesome laws which govern the progress of civilization, entailed upon them and their descendants the bitterest miseries. As they refused to enter into active intercourse with other nations for the purposes of self-culture, and stoutly resisted the introduction of foreign elements, in direct opposition to the designs of Providence, they degenerated into a stiff uniformity in every department of life, for lack of fresh educational elements to stir them up to renewed activity in the performance of their mission. All is at a stand-still. Even their language, which forms the basis of all true intellectual culture, because it is the organ for the expression of thought, possesses neither beauty nor flexibility, but is characterized by tedious monotony and a construction so arbitrary, as to render an acquaintance with it almost impossible. It is a law of universal application, clearly established by the facts of history, that those nations which do not strive to unfold their physical and mental resources by oft repeated efforts, and recruit their energies whenever exhausted by an appropriation of fresh material from abroad, lose all vigor, and, in the end, become what may be called historical petrification. Thus with the huge empire of China. It may be compared to an unwieldy machine of gigantic proportions, put in motion, not by any self-moving force, but by outward mechanical appliances, which continually produces the same effect and wastes its strength by the labor of its action. It has not only lost the results of the civilization its inhabitants obtained in those ages when they were characterized by some activity, but it has actually been undergoing a retrograde movement. The influence which it exerts at the present day upon the progress of society, is comparatively insignificant and trifling.

### § 15. *The Private Life of the Chinese.*

Among the Chinese, males and females dress in nearly the same apparel. The Tartar emperors, who never succeeded in destroying their peculiar customs, compelled them, nevertheless, to adopt the

practice of tonsuring. The age of twenty they regard as the transition from youth to manhood. Gentlemen of education, like the ladies of our own country, are in the habit of carrying an ornamental fan.

Females are educated in the family circle and kept in a state of strict seclusion. At the age of ten, boys are sent to school, where they learn to read and write. After having received instruction in the principles of a few useful works, they begin the study of the Sacred Books which form the basis of the entire political and social organization of China. Under the superintendence of the public authorities, whose business it is to inquire into the progress of the pupils, two annual examinations are instituted.

The Chinese wife lives in a state of complete retirement. Marriage contracts are formed by the parents, with the aid of some female friend, independantly of the wishes of the parties concerned. Various causes have tended to divest the females of China of their natural dignity. In the eastern provinces, particularly, where the overcrowded population induces mothers to strangle their babes at birth, they are treated with great disrespect.

In social intercourse, the Chinese are characterized by affected politeness and an unnatural stiffness of manners. The rules of etiquette, which they are bound to practice, are enforced by legal enactments as laid down in one of their old lawbooks. Their fastidious urbanity, especially towards public officers, and pedantic refinement, engender a cringing, slavish disposition, which destroys proper self-respect and prepares them to become the submissive tools of their superiors. Though extremely fond of feasts and lively sports, their domestic life presents a predominantly serious aspect.

In obedience to the laws of their religion, which have been invariably observed from time immemorial, they pay great respect to the dead.

#### § 16. *Their Public Life—The State.*

Chinese society is composed of two leading classes, the common people and the mandarins. The monks or priests constitute a sort of middle class. Agriculture is the principal employment; rice the chief product. Manufactures and trade receive a considerable share of attention, but are generally confined to the limits of the empire.

The Kuanfu, or as the Portuguese call them, the Mandarins, em-

bracing the superior officers, the literati, and the warriors, which are again subdivided into several distinct divisions, from the higher class.

The form of government is an unlimited monarchy, or a pure despotism. Divine honors are paid to the emperor, who is styled the Son of Heaven. A chief board of officers residing at Pekin, assisted by subordinate boards in the different provinces, conduct the machinery of government. With each board is connected a censor, whose business it is secretly to observe the actions of the people and to report to the emperor all movements which may threaten the ruin of the empire. The statute-book consists of two hundred and fifty volumes; the army of one million of men who possess neither strength nor courage; the navy is quite insignificant.

### § 17. *Chinese Art.*

In the department of Art considered as the expression of the beautiful in nature and spirit, in distinction from the useful arts which minister rather to the wants than to the pleasures of mankind, the Chinese occupy a very low rank. Their artists, as they never conceived a sublime idea, find most delight in the expression of distortion and deformity. Their productions consist of grotesque, disproportioned monsters, bearing the impress of childish folly and disgusting beyond measure.

According to the most authentic records, the Chinese received the first impulse to the study of art from India, 1 A. D., when they came in contact with the religious system of Fo (Buddha). But, as observed above, a marked feature in their character is the absence of imagination, and an absolute inability to comprehend the real significance of an idea in its pure essence. That poetical enthusiasm which lifts the soul above the confines of sense from things visible into the region of things invisible, is repressed and completely destroyed by the dry, prosaic tendency of the Chinese intellect. They are constitutionally disqualified either for the conception or appreciation of a work of true art. They were neither captivated with the glowing fancy of the Indian, nor stimulated to mental activity by the profundity of his speculations. When Indian art was transplanted to the soil of China, its glory and beauty departed.

The Indian Dagob, in the form of a water-bubble to represent the brevity and vanity of life, furnished the model for the most important architectural productions of China. Its proportions, however,

were considerably modified. The symbolical cupola was changed into a lofty steeple, rising up in nine successive stories, with small sloping roofs, narrowing as they approached the top; the tiles were painted with a brilliant yellow and the sides variegated with polished porcelain. The Chinese temples, which do not differ materially from the elegant mansions of private citizens, are of small dimensions. They are surrounded by rows of pillars. The roof is decorated by undulating lines, by carvings of fabled heroes and hideous figures. It is very evident from the historical remains of their artistic productions, which generally wear a repulsive, prosaic appearance, having neither grace nor justness of proportion, that the Chinese never came to an understanding of the real nature of the Fine Arts. But in the department of practical architecture, the great wall which extends along the northern frontier fifteen hundred miles in length, proves that they possessed superior skill in mechanical construction. It is said by those who have made the necessary calculations, that the materials of which it is composed would be sufficient to construct a wall of ordinary height and thickness around the whole earth. Mere accuracy of execution, however, does not by any means exhaust the conception of art. Therein precisely consists their defect, that they failed to discover the difference between useful and liberal arts, and converted the latter into mere mechanical drudgery. The artist, possessed of keen perception, whose taste has been trained to a just appreciation of the beautiful, may observe in the Chinese, as they gaze upon their works, the thought struggling up into existence, that the idea of art requires vastly more than a servile imitation of nature; but the embodiment of this thought in an outward form they never could accomplish. In the representation of domestic objects they evince an accuracy of observation worthy of praise. They paint insects, birds, fruits, and flowers, very beautifully, and render them quite attractive by the variety of their coloring. Their paintings, in many respects, resemble those of the Indians, but have not the same poetic beauty. In drawing, they are awkward and clumsy. Of perspective they have not the smallest notion. The fact that distant objects appear smaller than those immediately present, they attribute to a defect in the eyes. Of music the Chinese have ever been immoderately fond, but have neither skill in its execution nor a perception of proper harmony. Their gamut consisting of five tones, is very imperfect, the keys being inconsistent. They have no knowledge of semitones, or of counterpoint. The performance of their dra-

mas which, for the most part, are devoid of deep thought, and occupied with the representation of love scenes and harlequin tricks, is accompanied with music and song. Their best poetical productions, consisting partly of lyric, partly of didactic compositions, are contained in their canonical books. With novels and romances they are abundantly supplied. It is not necessary to enter into a minute description of their poetry. It is not characterized by any striking beauties; its chief defect is, a barrenness of lofty ideas. The Chinese who live in the cold region of the finite Understanding, and never entered the territory of pure thought, cannot be expected to excel in this department of art.

### § 18. *Chinese Science.*

Several causes have contributed to retard the progress of the Chinese in science. Apart from the influence of their natural disposition, which has no tendency at all towards the mystic and invisible, but is best satisfied with such ideas as require no labored thoughts, and commend themselves to an indolent mind by clear shallowness, their language—the best exponent of a nation's mind—on account of its poverty, its artificial arrangement and its stubborn inflexibility, opposes a barrier almost insurmountable. It is composed of only two hundred and seventy-two primitive roots. A variety of significations in no wise connected by inward similarity, but denoted by the modulation of the voice, by different methods of accentuation and by a host of written characters, is frequently attached to the same word. Our knowledge of Chinese science is still very limited, notwithstanding the recent learned researches of European antiquarians. China has never been the theatre of great philosophical developments. Its learned men seldom allow their minds to be disturbed by profound meditation on the essence of Deity, and the relation which he sustains to the world. Their labor is expended on the different branches of natural philosophy, on geography, on medicine, and in the formation of scientific encyclopedias.

On the subject of Chinese literature, the Spanish Dominican Pater Taso, who, in 1703, composed the first Chinese grammar, deserves particular praise. In the beginning of the last century, a lexicon was issued by the Minoret Basilius a Flemona, containing definitions of ten thousand written characters. During the present century Antonio Martucci, of Siena, and Julius Klaproth, of Berlin, have thrown much light upon the antiquities of China. Of most

value, however, is the work of Abel Reumsat on the Chinese language, published at Paris, 1822.

### § 19. *Chinese Religion.*

The old religious system of the Chinese was of a simple and patriarchal character. Here, as well as in their civilization, generally, they never advanced beyond the first stage of culture. They adored one supreme, all-powerful Being, believed in the existence of Genii and protecting spirits, who were subject to His control, and placed a high value on the efficacy of prayer and sacrifices. When Confucius appeared, the ancient religion had lost its power. Gross immorality abounded. The entire nation was involved in religious and political disorders. He endeavored to correct the vices which had crept into the state by representing the prince as the father of his people, and to suppress the prevailing licentiousness by insisting on the cultivation of those practical virtues which had in former days crowned China with prosperity. His ethical system was gladly welcomed by those who mourned over the degradation of their country. After his death, his disciples, who were enthusiastically attached to his person, zealously propagated his doctrines. Contemporary with Confucius flourished another religious system of an Epicurean character. It discarded the doctrine of immortality, and sought to break the power of death by medical prescriptions. About the time of Christ, the Fo religion was transplanted to China from India. At the present day, it numbers about one million of priests, who impose upon the people the grossest superstitions.

But all the religious systems of China, that of Confucius not excepted, whose ethical precepts were certainly well adapted to promote the temporal interests of his countrymen, could not restore man to a proper moral position. We seek in vain for a recognition of the true nature of sin, which had disturbed the harmony of his soul. That, which forms the grand characteristic of all true religion—the idea of an atonement for sin, as the only means of deliverance from its power—is left out of sight altogether. There are some historians, who go so far as to consider the Fo system a perfected form of Atheism.

The question, which has of late elicited considerable discussion, whether the religion of Fo can be regarded as being identical with the Buddhism of India, admits of no satisfactory solution, on account of the defectiveness of our historical information.

### § 20. *Concluding Remarks.*

The gigantic empire of China presents the astonishing spectacle of an entire nation remaining stationary for thousands and thousands of years. Here the most modern is at the same time the most ancient. Its civilization is, as it were, stereotyped. Its present condition is marked by the same features it possessed centuries ago; no improvement, no advance of society is discernable. Why this? Providence, surely, never intended that any nation should be compelled to check its growth at any particular period of its history, and become stagnant. Progression is the divinely appointed law of the Universe. But this progress depends upon certain fixed principles, and one of them is, that a nation must not surround itself with the net of selfishness, and obstinately refuse intercourse with its neighbors, but open its ports for the reception of those commodities its own territory does not supply, and enrich its own poverty by the appropriation of the rich treasures of foreign nations. The geographical isolation of China has left its seal invincibly stamped upon the social, political, intellectual and moral character of its inhabitants. On this account it is, that Chinese civilization presents a dwarfish, stunted appearance. Again, a solid and progressive civilization depends upon the healthy growth of society generally, and the gradual improvement of its individual members. These two factors must never contradict each other; the amelioration of the social system must go hand in hand with the expansion of the faculties of individuals. The predominance of any one of them tends invariably to stop the advancement of civilization. In China, the interests of the one are secured at the expense of the other. An empty tyrannical formalism rules with imperious sway, subordinating to itself every individual movement and crushing the risings of personal freedom. That spiritual instinct, the birthright of every nation, which stirs up to activity the native energies of a people, is completely destroyed. Society becomes still more unsettled, if this outward despotism stands above the common interests of the people, refuses to sympathize with their necessities and alleviate their miseries. Such is the actual condition of China. Its government is conducted by a few aristocratic families, who own no affinity with their subjects, but keep them in check with the rod of tyranny. Educated under the influence of such defective views of life, the spirit of the nation has quietly sunk into the miserable slavery of traditional laws, and fallen under the control of cruel tyrants.

## ART. XLI.—A PLEA FOR OUR OLFACTORIES.

I AM not inclined to fall in with the great German critics, when they assert in their books that with the inferior senses poetry has nothing to do; that with the two superior, the visual and the auditory, it holds all its sweet converse. As regards the rest of the Fine Arts this may be true enough. Music, I admit, thrills at once the auditory nerve, and painting, sculpture and architecture throw at once their beautiful images on the *camera obscura* of the eye. The impressions created within, are fac-similes of the outward objects. Their pleasures, therefore, may be said properly, to belong to the eye or ear. They have little to do with the other senses. But is this the case with poetry? When read aloud to us, does it impart to the tympanum of the ear its fac-similes? In the mere sound of its words does its rapture wholly consist? I am disposed to think not. Little else than the part of a telegraphic wire does the auditory nerve, in this case, perform, conveying unweetingly its despatches to the sensorium behind. Again, when silently we peruse a poem, does it impress on the retina of the eye its images, or pictures? Certainly not. Impressed there are only letters. Still further back, on the sensorium, are brought out its daguerreotypings, by the imagination. This faculty, however, has the power of setting forth, not only visions, but also fragrances. In descriptive poetry, it can make us catch the very odors of the scene portrayed. Our olfactories are wrought upon often as powerfully as our organs of sight. Our noses, to be sure, have no Fine Art of their own, addressing them immediately from without, but do they not, in poetic pleasures, participate with our eyes and ears? Do not their fancies often form the sweetest parts of a described landscape?

Of the nose, what low ideas are too generally entertained by the romantic, unreflecting portion of mankind—*ignobile vulgus*! As a mere sentinel set over the mouth, with which alone it sympathizes, they consider it! All its annoyances and abuses they remember; all its sensitive delights they forget! As a standing butt, they look upon it, if in any-wise peculiar in its shape, at which any one may be hurling his rude jests. Though in outward show, the most imposing, commanding organ, they consider it in real importance the very least; and were its virtue for them destroyed, which, in truth, I would not care if it was, considering how little they can appre-

ciate its advantages, nothing thereat they declare they would be grieved, but rather somewhat delighted, as in that case they would be freed from its intolerable stenches. A becoming ornament to the countenance they admit, for they cannot deny it, that it is; but from its position, they exclaim, how wonderfully exposed to being tweaked! How wonderfully well adapted too, they should have observed, for penetrating into the corols of blossoms, or for extending its orifices over fruits or mouths of bottles, and extracting thence their odors! Have not the eyes and ears their annoyances and antipathies too, their ugly sights and discordant sounds? If those addressed to the nose be more offensive, is not this indicative of its having finer feelings? Must not its joys be, in proportion, more lively and exhilarating? Even its professed advocates, those who have spoken and written in its behalf, have not always seized on its strongest points. Why does Slawkenbergius dwell so much on its physical proportions and make so little account of its sensitive shrewdness, as he is represented by Sterne? In that adjudged case too, of Cowper, though, to be sure, the spectacles in fine are awarded to the nose, yet, why is it shown off, while wearing them thus confirmed, the eyes shut the while, in such an asinine, ridiculous position? In truth, that whole case is fabulous; well suited, no doubt, to convey an instructive moral, but certainly not in character. To be putting in claims for spectacles, or any other chattel, belonging to the eyes, is not after the modest fashion of the nose. The grievances have always been from the other side. The Peter robbed has generally been this organ, and the Pauls paid thereby eyes. For inestimable favors conferred upon us by our olfactories, we are too prone to award the whole credit to our visual organs.

Of poetry addressed to the nose, the finest specimens are not to be met with in the ancient classics. The Greeks and Romans indulged in many "odoraments to smell to," it is true. In liquid odors for their heads they delighted, and their festival chaplets were often redolent; of which things their lyric bards make honorable mention, for which we thank them. Indeed, in their love of perfumes they far surpassed the moderns; but, after all, they cannot be said, in their day, to have come to the ascertainment of the full poetic faculty of the nose. That harmonizing of the senses, that rendering, in descriptions, the perceptions of one more vivid by using metaphorically for it the appropriate language of another, the old Greek authors were not wholly ignorant of, I admit. With

them, however, the transitions were generally ascending. To render more graphic their descriptions of speech, or music, they often borrowed language appropriate to the eye; but they never reversed the order. To aid descriptions of the eye's perceptions, they never condescended to employ the language of the ear, and certainly not that of the lower senses. Thus Sophocles in his *Oedipus Tyrannus*:

Ἐλαμψε γὰρ τοῦ νιφοίντος αρτίως φανεῖσα  
Φάμα παρνασσοῦ——

*Shone forth just now hath the splendid voice*  
From snow-clad Parnassus——

Indeed, their transitions were confined almost wholly to the upper two senses, the visual and the auditory. Into the most worshipful society of these, they seldom suffered to pass the perceptions of the nose. They looked upon it as a plebeian. It had little to do with the ideal world. Its tendencies were downward. With the satirical upturning of this organ the Romans were especially struck. *Naso suspendere adunco*, was with them a favorite figure. Nicety of judgment too, they typified by it. Him of shrewd intellect they described as being *emunctæ naris*. The internal, invisible traits of the mind, they thus showed forth figuratively by means of the external visible features of the senses. As an aid to hearing, however, already furnished with its own beautiful, external volutes, to call into requisition the perceptions of the nose, never entered into their fancies. To them this would have seemed like painting the lily, or throwing a perfume on the violet.

It was reserved for modern bards to arrive at the full truth in this matter. They found out, or rather felt intuitively, that music is only vibrations; that it does not blend with the surrounding atmosphere; that of aromatics, on the other hand, the effluvia are mingled with the breeze; that they become of their conveying fluid an intermixed portion, and thus are brought into actual contact with our olfactory nerves. Possessing, therefore, of music the ethereal sublimity, they have besides of taste the pungent reality, without any of its grossness. No wonder then that, from comparison with odors, music suffers not; that, in fact, its descriptions in this way, are rendered more graphic; at any rate under the ennobling hand of Shakespeare:

If music be the food of love, play on;  
 Give me excess of it; that surfeiting,  
 The appetite may sicken, and so die.—  
 That strain again; — it had a dying fall:  
 O, it came o'er my ear *like the sweet south,*  
*That breathes upon a bank of violets,*  
*Stealing and giving odor.*"

*Twelfth Night. Act. I. Scene I.*

Milton, too, is pleased with such comparisons. Being deprived of sight, we might at first imagine that his other senses, from being called into more frequent use, on account of his loss, had thus become more sensitive and refined; wherefore he was led often to draw from their perceptions his similes. Not in his *Paradise Lost*, however, nor in his *Paradise Regained*, do we meet with the most striking examples of these, but in his minor poems, which were written in his youth, when his fancy was in its full bloom and his organs were all complete. Not, therefore, to his being confined to fewer senses, can we attribute his tact in this way, but to his full poetic temperament. Thus, for instance, in the *Masque of Comus*, he says:

"At last, a soft and solemn-breathing sound  
 Rose, *like a stream of rich distilled perfumes,*  
*And stole upon the air, that even Silence*  
 Was took ere she was ware, and wish'd she might  
 Deny her nature, and be never more  
 Still, to be so displaced."

Indeed, not to odors alone, but sometimes even to the dull sensations of touch, he dares compare music, and that too, certainly, with the finest effect; as again in the same *Masque*:

"Can any mortal mixture of earth's mould,  
 Breathe such divine, enchanting ravishment?  
 Sure something holy lodges in that breast,  
 And with these raptures moves the vocal air  
 To testify his hidden residence:  
 How sweetly did they float upon the wings  
 Of silence, through the empty vaulted night,  
 At every fall *smoothing* the raven down  
 Of darkness till it smiled!"

Descriptive poetry resembles landscape painting in a measure, it is true; but instead of its addresses being confined to the eye, as is too generally supposed to be the case, of its choice passages, some of the sweetest are spoken to the ear, and the most affecting,

or certainly the raciest, to the nose. Indeed, of this last organ to the pleasures, as being the most exhilarating, the true poet rises up mostly, as it were, by a sort of climax or gradation in description. In setting forth his landscape, in the first place, he directs our fancy to its visual objects, then he lets us hear, if he can, the chirpings of its feathered quiristers; but last of all, to complete the picture and lap us in Elysium, he makes us breathe besides its fragrance. The nearest thing to eating a landscape, which, of course, we cannot do, is, in my opinion, the inhaling of its spicy breath. No matter, on the other hand, how charming to the eye may be the scenery described, or melodious to the ear the chanting of its birds, if, in the slightest degree, its air be offensive to the nose, it can never please. Thus Chaucer, in *The Floure and the Leafe*, makes his gentlewoman describe, in the first place, the surrounding oaks and the secreted arbor set "with sicamour and eglatere" in which she was standing; then of the song from a goldfinch on a medlar-tree, answered by that of a nightingale, whose position was yet unseen, she discourses; but last of all, in the following strain of the combined fragrance of the laurer tree and eglentere, (now called the bay-tree and sweet-brier,) she stirreth up the sweet remembrance:

"Wherefore I waited about busily  
On every side if I her (the nightingale) might see,  
And at the last I gan full well aspie  
Where she sat in a fresh grene laurer tree,  
On the further side even right by me,  
That gave so passing a delicious smell,  
According to the eglentere full well.

Wherof I had so inly great pleasure,  
That as me thought I surely ravished was  
Into Paradice, where my desire  
Was for to be, and no ferther passe  
As for that day, and on the sote grasse  
I sat me downe, for as for mine entent,  
The birds song was more conuenient,

And more pleasaunt to me by manifold,  
Than meat or drinke, or any other thing,  
Thereto the herber (arbor) was so fresh and cold,  
The wholesome sauours eke so comforting,  
That as I demed, sith the beginning  
Of the world was never seene or than  
So pleasaunt a ground of none earthly man."

In the same way Milton represents the arch fiend, when approaching the borders of Eden, as being struck, in the first place, with the tempting beauty of the fruits and blossoms on the branches overreaching the high verdurous wall. Then, being still too distant, no doubt, to hear its music, he is inspired next, as set forth in the following lines, by the odors wafted in its breezes :

—————“so lovely seemed  
 That landscape; and of pure now purer air  
 Meets his approach, and to the heart inspires  
 Vernal delight and joy, able to drive  
 All sadness but despair: now gentle gales  
 Fanning their odoriferous wings, dispense  
 Native perfumes, and whisper whence they stole  
 Those balmy spoils. As when to them who sail  
 Beyond the Cape of Hope, and now are past  
 Mozambique, off at sea north-east winds blow  
 Sabéan odors from the spicy shore  
 Of Araby the bless'd; with such delay  
 Well pleased they slack their course, and many a league  
 Cheered with the grateful smell old Ocean smiles.  
 So entertained these odorous sweets the fiend,  
 Who came their bane.”

*Paradise Lost. Book IV.*

Somewhat after the same manner, but with a bolder leap, Shakespeare, in setting forth the old romantic castle of Macbeth, springs at once, not *in medias* but *in ultimas res*. Without mentioning its impressions on the eye or ear, he calls up to the imagination its whole charming appearance by touching at once on the freshness of its surrounding atmosphere. Thus discourse king Duncan and Banquo while, after having dismounted, they are walking up leisurely towards its timehallowed front, regarding, with expanded nostrils, its imposing aspect:

“DUNCAN:—This castle has a pleasant seat: *the air*  
*Nimbly and sweetly recommends itself*  
*Unto our gentle senses.*”

“BANQUO:— This guest of summer,  
 The temple-haunting martlet, does approve,  
 By his loved mansionry, *that the h'aven's breath*  
*Smells wooingly here.* No jutty, frieze,  
 Buttress, nor coigne of vantage, but this bird  
 Hath made his pendent bed, and procreant cradle:  
 Where they most breed and haunt, I have observed,  
*The air is delicate.”*

*Macbeth. Act I. Scene VI.*

Reader, hast thou ever feasted thine olfactories on the blossoms of that shrub which, on account of their surpassing fragrance, is known commonly by the name of the sweet-scented (*calycanthus floridus*)? Certainly thou hast, for it is now everywhere cultivated by the tasteful in their redolent gardens. I rejoice exceedingly that it is no exotic; that it is not confined even to the Southern States as falsely laid down by botanists in their books, but that it is the production also of mine own native county. From my window now, far down the valley, I can catch a faint glimpse of that transcendent knob, at whose base it once bloomed abundantly. *Troja fuit!* Its humble growth, not continuous, but in sparse clusters or single twigs, was confined to a small tract of ground, in some places rocky, carpeted with moss or mouldering leaves, overshadowed with oaks and other trees, embracing perhaps ten acres. It was its only region. In all my rambles north of Mason's and Dixon's line, I never fell in with another *placer*. Its blooming season was in May or June. And think you, it was left unobserved "to waste its sweetness on the desert air?" I tell you nay. Though in its scent was its whole attractive force—a dark, brown flower, without any outward show—yet, it acted as a powerful magnet, drawing, in its season, towards its hallowed precincts, many a cavalcade of youthful votaries often from twenty miles around. With these, once or twice, in my juvenility, I was drawn along, nothing loth. They partook, in some degree, of the pleasantry and good fellowship of that company, described by Chaucer, which wended on pilgrimage to Canterbury. Their riders were not grouped, however, so diversely nor promiscuously, but strung out more at length into pairs of opposite sexes. What were prospects or Mayings or berry-gatherings in comparison? We were going on the sublimer embassage of the nose. Like those pilgrims of Chaucer, we too dismounted, on our way, after having come over a disclosing hill, at our "gentil hostelrie," in the mountain-shadowed village of Strasburg, that was highte the Rising Sun; where we tarried and refreshed ourselves, an hour or two, ere we diverged from the main road westward into a narrower, shadier way, conducting us toward the enchanted region.

"Gret chere made oure hoste us everich on,  
And to the souper sette he us anon:  
And served us with vitaille of the beste."

Mine host of the Rising Sun, now enjoying thy placid retirement and green old age in that ancient neighborhood, still dost thou sympathize with me, at least in part, on these savory reminiscences. In one thing, however, thou didst come short. Though a seemly man thou "wast with alle, for to han ben a marshal in an halle," yet thou wast not perfect in all thy parts. Except as tractors to others thou caredst nothing for the shrubs. To thee, as thou toldst me *sub rosa*, they smelt like chintzes. O, most unaccountable monomania of the nose! By thine idiosyncrasy from what a paradise wast thou excluded! Into what a Pandemonium was thou thrust! To us, and to every one in his sane nasal sense, they smelt like taste of strawberry or pine-apple only transcendently more exhilarating and delicious. Tales like those told on the way to Canterbury, or, indeed, of any sort, we had none. If told at all, it was only on the charmed ground to lady's ear. I regret exceedingly, as my country's loss, that, of late years, that spot has been desecrated, cropt off and rooted up by wandering herds and flocks. How conducive were its walks to courtship and romance! How awakening to love and poetry!

I am not ashamed to own that I sometimes give myself up entirely to the soft imaginings of my nose; that, stretched beneath some umbrageous beech-tree, I permit myself to be carried away by the inspirations of that organ, swept over, like an Aeolian lyre, by the passing breezes. *Amabilis insanus.*

"Audire et videor pios  
Errare per lucos amoenaæ  
Quos et aquæ subeunt et auræ."

In this way, instead of being degraded, I feel myself exalted. What utilitarian careth for odors as such? *Cui bono?* he crieth aloud. We confess, they cannot be turned into any practical utility; that no man becometh fatter or richer from having feasted on them his olfactories. They improve not his health nor his outward estate. No purely practical man, therefore, we are willing to admit, nor, in fact, any inferior animal, followeth after fragrances as a good in themselves. Their uses are higher. They strengthen our imaginations and superior faculties. They convey us at once into the aesthetic regions. How absurd then in any critic to exclude their organs from the province of the Fine Arts! It was a curious fact that, on arriving at that odorating spot of the shrubs

above described, the votaries generally felt disposed to lisp in numbers. A few became for the time actually improvisators; others quoted old scraps of verse, while hardly one refrained from addressing, at any rate his partner, in strains of soft but highly impassioned eloquence. The most inveterate case that came under the divine afflatus of these blossoms, was that of H. G. He was a bachelor and affluent dry-goods-merchant in the somewhat distant village of S. From his boyhood he had been brought up to worship only Mammon. With him money was the *summum bonum*; and from all fragrances he turned away his scornful nose, as being unsatisfying and designed to mislead him from the tangible.

Like Chaucer's merchant,

“ His reson spake he ful solempnely  
Sounding alway the encrese of his winning.”

Having set forth from S——, one pleasant May-morning, on a collecting trip to the village of Strasburg, he was overtaken on the way by a select party of his acquaintance on their annual pilgrimage to the knob. For his own benefit they impressed him into their company. Observing in him, however, symptoms of uneasiness, a disposition at one time to gallop a-head, and, at another, to lag behind, they placed him under the safe-keeping of a sprightly young widow hight Mrs. Maria T. who held him in tow. When arrived at Strasburg, he would certainly have made his escape and gone about his collecting business, but he was restrained by a prudent gentleman of the party, who took him aside and reminded how extremely improper and impolitic in him it would be to desert the widow, who, without him, would be a supernumerary. She was one of his best customers, wearing actually at the time a riding habit the materials of which had been purchased at his own store. That he might not offend her, therefore, he was induced to go along; but when arrived at the spot, he showed no out-bursts of inspiration. He gathered no shrubs; but in fact scandalized the whole party by remarking that he would just as soon collect as many hops; and indeed rather, as such blossoms were wholesome and could be turned to some profitable account. Thereupon they gave him up as a hopeless case, a man whose imagination was utterly siccated, and they took no further pains to retain him in their company; so that on returning they lost sight of him, lagging behind, before

they reached Strasburg; but what was their astonishment, on the following week, to observe in the S—— Gazette, his advertisement of new goods, extending down nearly half a column, composed the whole way in most capital verse!

As "the lover, the lunatic, and the poet, are of imagination all compact," no wonder that the spot was conducive also to courtship and matrimony. For every enamored swain, in that section of country, when he wished after a winter's hard siege, to bring at length his courtship to a happy consummation, it was a prevailing usage to invite his fair one to accompany him with others on a pilgrimage to the shrubs. Should she consent to be his partner on that occasion, he was a made-up man. He had no further difficulty in the case; as proposals among the shrubs were never scorned. They were always followed by espousals. Had the ancient Greeks and Romans been acquainted with the name and virtues of this aromatic they would certainly have crowned their god of marriage, Hymenæus with it instead of the fragrant *amaracus*. That unprecedented emigration latterly of forlorn bachelors from that neighborhood, drawn away, no doubt, by the unsatisfied yearnings of their noses, to remote southern and western climes, and the increased number, consequent thereupon, of deserted spinsters now to be met with throughout that whole section of country, I feel fully persuaded, is to be attributed, perhaps entirely, as a primitive cause, to the correspondingly increased numbers of ruthless swine and horned cattle which, of late years, have been permitted to roam at large through the once blissful but now desecrated vicinity of that stupendous knob.

W. M. N.

---

#### ART. XLII.—THE RELATION OF CHURCH AND STATE.

"WHAT constitutes reality?" This is the great and fundamental question which has divided the literary world, like the physical, into two great hemispheres. According to the one mode

of thought, that only is *real* and *true*, the origin, the nature, the use and end of which can be determined by the calculating understanding, and stated in just so many words. Science is nothing more than the enumeration of phenomena and facts, and their classification as may be agreed upon by the learned. "Life itself is a mere harmony, an effect." Society is merely an aggregation of individuals united from choice. Government is a full grown "*Minerva*" sprung from the head of human wisdom. The State is a social compact entered into for the mutual defence of life property and rights. The Church is but the collective body of believers, who take the Bible as the ground of their faith and rule of their life:—the Bible, however, as interpreted by each one for himself, without being in the least dependent upon tradition, or the united wisdom of the church of by-gone ages. All relations are external, more or less, mechanical and arbitrary.

Natural phenomena stand related merely through the medium of contiguity, or mental association. The different members of the state are held together by the bond of interest, and motives of expediency. The bond of union between church members, is like that between the different parts of a mechanism, held together by the force of external power; or, to say the most, it is merely of a moral character, as, for instance, the bond of friendship. The Church and State stand related as two voluntary associations; as, for instance, the societies of Free Masons and Odd Fellows, holding each other at respectful distance, from motives of mutual jealousy, and sometimes uniting the hands of friendship from motives of policy.

We do not maintain that this utilitarian, common sense practical philosophy is utterly void of truth, but that it is greatly at fault: it is one-sided, incomplete, outward, mechanical.

According to the other mode of thought, there is a world of truth, and ideas beyond the present world—"ideas," as observed by a learned author of our day, "that are fixed and eternal, more stable than the earth, more permanent than the heavens"—ideas that were never born and can never die, and from which alone individual things derive reality, and by partaking of which they become objects of science."

The general goes before the particular ; the whole before its parts. Science is the objective truth in a subjective form. Physical and metaphysical phenomena are the diagrams of the invisible and eternal. Life is an identifying principle, ever unfolding itself according to the law of its own being. Society is a concrete generality. Civil law is not the will of man expressed with reference to his temporal well-being, but the very plastic power by which the character of man is forming for a higher state of being.

The State is a divine institution, a power ordained of God, perfect in its ideal, though sadly imperfect in its real existence. Above the State is the Church, the "Body of Christ," the fullness of him that filleth all in all," "the Bride of the Everlasting Bridegroom." The subject of the present article has not come up to our view exactly as Ezekial's vision of a wheel within a wheel, neither one of which touched the other ; but rather as two great organisms, each of which is the development of a life peculiar to itself, whilst the integral parts of the one are also the integral parts or members of the other. The relation of the Church and State, therefore, must be internal and necessary, hidden and mysterious, as well as external in its character. To this we can find nothing analogous in nature.

Some have supposed that the analogue is to be found in the human constitution, that the soul and body of man have each an identifying principle of their own, and that these two principles in their development interpenetrate each other so as to constitute one life. No such duality, however, exists in fact, the human body without the soul has no life, it is a mere corpse, and the soul without the body resolves itself into pure spirit, and is incomplete. The *union* of the two is essential to the idea of humanity : body and soul condition each other as form and contents. There is in all life an immanent necessity and tendency to externalize itself, to become real for something else, i. e., it develops itself in the form of body. The soul and body of man are but the internal and external sides of *one* and the *same* life.

This may serve to illustrate either the idea of the State or the Church, separately considered ; but not the mysterious relation of the one to the other, not, at least, without considerable modi-

fication. Were we to adopt the utilitarian philosophy, which is but a modification of the theory of *fluxions* entertained by the ancient Ionian school, that views *every thing* as in a state of constant fluctuation and change—nothing for a single moment maintaining a fixed identity—no internal law or power to bind and control the ever floating atoms of the material and moral worlds, we must, of course, come to the conclusion that the State is a mere structure, as Cæsar would call it, built upon the waters; a mere police system to maintain order among the inhabitants of the earth; a mere human regulation to secure the temporal welfare of our race. But then, according to this view, as one generation of men after another passes away, the State itself must necessarily die, on an average, at the expiration of every thirty years, and can only be revived again by a kind of political galvanism. This view, though shallow and infidel, has found many advocates in modern times. Civil law being nothing more than the will of man, has no divine authority and power. In the form of government called the Monarchy, it is but the will of the monarch with reference to his subjects; in the Aristocratic form of government, it is but the will of the few in reference to the many; and in the Republican form of government it is the will of the majority of the people expressed with reference to the minority or the whole.

According to this view, the State has no reality: her life has become extinct, and government has become absolute. There may be an absolute democracy as well as an absolute monarchy. The popular will may tyrannize, as well as the individual; and then to speak of the relation of Church and State becomes impossible: our subject, in this case, resolves itself into the relation of the human will to the divine, as the latter is revealed through the medium of the Gospel.

This view is destined to give way, however, to that more elevated system of philosophy, which teaches that the state is an institution of divine origin, that it is the natural, the necessary and specific form under which human life, in its manifold departments, is developed and actualized.

According to Hegel, "the state is the actualness of the moral idea;" "the divine will present in the actual form and organiza-

tion of a world unfolding spirit;" "die reiche Gliederung des Sittlichen in sich."<sup>\*</sup> It is the entire human family organized, animated and bound together by a common, internal, necessary and specific law, giving form and character to all individual human life. It is, of course, obvious that the State has an outward form; it is closely allied to nature and the world of sense; it has its temporal and worldly interests to subserve. But this its external side is not to be placed in opposition to its internal life or spirit; they are the necessary complements of each other, as soul and body. The State then being the necessary form of all human life, it is impossible for man to exist or live excepting in this relation. As well might we expect the branch separated from the vine to yield its annual fruits, or the feathered songsters of the air to warble their notes of praise in the briny deep, or the finny tribes to play upon the desert sand, as for man to live separated from the general life of his race. The State therefore must be as ancient as the human family; and the history of the world is the development of State life, which increases and grows with the increase and growth of our race. The last recorded fact of the world's history will be the *consummation* of this mysterious growth.

But the internal IDEA of the State is not to be confounded with the origin of its external form. It is true, symptoms of organic life are never witnessed excepting in union with its conditions; these, however, do not contain any life giving principle: for this we must always look to a higher source. "The idea," in the language of the author already quoted, "is and ever must be *one*; but the external origin may be as various as the ever varying circumstances of mankind." The external origin may be the amplification of the family, as most of the earlier States were; it may be the social compact, of which so much is written and said; it may be the result of a long series of causes, bringing men together within geographical limits: or, as in our own country, it may be the result of revolution.

\* In borrowing these convenient forms of expression from Hegel, we do not wish to be understood as having any sympathy whatever with the pantheistic tendency of his system, nor with the peculiar view of his, according to which the State is made to swallow up the Church.

It is only, however, when the mass of dry bones, thus providentially thrown together, "are clothed with sinews, muscles and flesh, and have breathed into them the breath of life, that the nation, according to the etymology of the term, can be said to have been born." Hence the multitude of the States. So also we may account for the variety of form in state government; but all these being pervaded, and animated by the general law of political life are gathered up as parts of the world embracing state organism.

According to this view, the State is constitutionally a divine power, having all the functions and characteristics of a religious institution. These functions may be denominated: the *Regal*, the *Educational*, and the *Devotional*; the first having reference more particularly to the will, the second to the intellect, and the third to the affections. In the exercise of her regal power, the State exerts a sovereign sway over the lower portions of creation. Man, viewed as an individual, is justly styled the lord of creation; yet his regal character can only hold fully in the conscious union of his race; hence the State makes all the lower kingdoms of the world tributary to herself: by her power the earth is subdued: the beasts of the forest are made to fear and tremble, and the very elements are controlled. She also sways the sceptre of dominion over her own subjects; she governs, defends and protects them: she executes upon offenders the penalty of the law, and reprieves whom she will. Whether, now, the reigning sovereignty of the State be vested in the monarch, the aristocracy, or in those set apart as rulers by the popular will, the ultimate sovereignty is vested in fundamental law as such, which exists in the world as the true representative of the Majesty in the heavens, governing alike the governor and the governed. The reigning sovereignty can only derive its authority and power from the ultimate. Here is the true ground of obedience to the "powers that be"; and only he is the free man whose will harmonizes with the divine will as thus revealed.

The Regal power of the State is inseparably connected with the Educational. Indeed, law and authority are always educational in their nature and tendency. By this we do not mean that the State merely encourages education among the masses

of the people by establishing schools, colleges, and other seminaries of learning, and by exercising a superintendence over them; but that the very hidden meaning of her constitution, the very substance of the idea, as well as the truth of nature generally, are expressed through the medium of conscious intelligence. Man is so constituted as to take up the objective truth in whatever form it may be revealed, to embody it in his very constitution, and to become its living interpreter; and whilst this in the case of the single individual, as in the instance adduced, it is *preëminently* true of man in his conscious union with the race. As the state organism, therefore, embodies in it the elements of understanding and reason, of conscious intelligence, it is the living exponent of the truth: and hence no one is disposed to gainsay when a point is once settled by the united testimony of the whole world, or when it is once confirmed by the ever living voice of the State. But there is in the subjective truth a necessity and tendency again to become objective: i. e., having been reproduced in the way of reflection and thought, it is collected in the form of literature, and becomes objective to the present and succeeding generations. The world's literature, therefore, may be viewed as the product of state life under this particular form. That is, the State is constitutionally educational in her character. Being associated with the moral universe of God, her design and tendency is to educate man for a higher state of society. All her outward ends, such as the preservation of life, property, and rights, are but secondary in this.

But the moral and intellectual nature of man cannot be separated from the religious. Morality without religion has no soul: if conformity to the law do not spring from a living principle, it is merely outward—it is worthless. Religion, however, is devotional: therefore the state life also unfolds itself in the form of devotion. There has ever been in the world a feeling of dependence upon the Supreme Being; and even when the knowledge of the true God was lost, this feeling was still manifested in the worship of the Deity as he was supposed to be enshrined in the objects of nature and the works of art.

The devotional feeling also manifests itself in that essential form of state religion, which still exists in Christian countries,

viz: the civil oath. The subjective truth being constantly in danger of perversion by depraved man, seeks protection in the objective and eternal. The State conscious of her dependences upon the supernatural and supreme, reverently appeals to High Heaven in this form for safety and protection. It is only possible, however, for the State to attain a full consciousness of her dependence through that medium in which God has given the fullest revelation of himself to the world, i. e., the Church. As the Church borrows her social character from the State in the form of marriage, so the State is indebted for the true idea of the oath to the Church. This is the two-fold bond of their internal union. If we may conceive of these two divine institutions under the figure of two ships upon the ocean, sailing side by side, we would say that the oath and marriage are the strong grapnels, by which they are indissolubly bound together.

Our view of the ideal State, therefore, can only hold in its union with the Church, which, we trust, will become still more apparent as we proceed.

From all that has now been said, it will follow that all the office-bearers of the State are vested with a sacred character. The civil ruler does not merely bear the sword of utilitarian, but of vindictive justice. Lawyers, whose office it is to unfold the hidden mysteries of law and truth, are oracles of God. Magistrates, who administer the oath in civil courts, minister at the altar of the Most High.

The real State, as it is presented to our view in history, and the ideal are not isolated and separate things: they stand related as the real and ideal humanity: as the latter is actualized in the former, so the real is ever struggling onward and upward towards its final consummation in the ideal.

The world is under the dominion of sin and evil, and until this dominion be broken, it is not possible for the real state to reach her ideal. We may suppose that, by moral, intellectual, and religious culture, literature, morality, and state religion may reach an elevation hitherto unknown; but as long as the stream of life, unfolding itself in the specific form now described, is tainted with sin, the State *cannot* become complete: much less can humanity be brought into that close and intimate union

with the divine nature for which it was designed in the original creation. Hence the necessity of the new creation, a still higher plastic power, viz: the HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH. Of all powers this is the greatest and most imposing: of all bodies this divine human organism is the most perfect and complete: of all realities this is the greatest and most sublime.

In contemplating the Christian church, we must not view it as an *ideal*, suspended midway between heaven and earth, for man to gaze upon and admire: neither as a separate planet spoken into being by the divine word, and inhabited by a separate order of intelligences: nor as a world suspended within reaching distance from our earth, to which her inhabitants may pass at pleasure, so as to lose their citizenship here: neither should we view it as a purely spiritual influence, which has gone out upon the great ocean of human mind to calm the turbulent waters of life: nor yet as a religious institution planted at the *side* of the State, so that we can say, the one is here and the other there: but as a higher order of divine life in *this world*, which, in its development, takes to itself a body from the elements of humanity.

The principle of this new life is the *Lord Jesus Christ*, the incarnate *Saviour*, who is very God and very man in one person, and in whom dwells all the fullness of the God-head bodily. In him the divine and human natures are united as they never were before. The union is *deep, mysterious and vital*. The growth of the Church is the development of Christ's life in the world. To attempt a separation of the Church from the person of Christ, is to attempt a separation between the soul and body: it is to destroy the very life of the Lamb's Bride. "No Christ, no Church; and no Church, no Christ." The Church is the body of Christ, and Christ is the life of the Church: they are INSEPARABLE. And as the Church life, in its development, as well as that of the State, take up *all* the elements of our nature; as the life of Christ animates the whole man, soul and body, it follows that the state life and church life flow into and interpenetrate each other: not that they are so mixed as to become something different from both: nor that the one loses its identity in the other: but the State life is purified and invigorated by that of

the Church, so that it is possible by the former to reach its ideal perfection. They are one, but yet distinct. This is mysterious; but must be believed nevertheless: for to disbelieve is to deny all faith in both Church and State as present realities. Humanity may be viewed as a mysterious tree, whose roots strike deep into the ground of nature, whose wide spreading branches overshadow the whole earth, and whose top is destined to reach the highest heavens. Its growth, however, is found to be feeble and sickly: the branches spread; but they tend towards the earth. But now there is a new principle of life introduced, which, in its development, throws off and overcomes every thing that would retard its growth, and the tree of humanity, thus invigorated, rapidly tends towards its culminating point of ideal perfection. Shall we then conclude that the Church is merely a remedial agent; that her design is merely to restore to man what he lost in consequence of sin; and that the kingdom of God is to be established in the world, according to Professor Rothe, in the form of the State? The Church being constitutionally holy and catholic, we reply, is such a remedial agent: she dries up the fountains of sin and misery: she heals the diseases of our fallen nature, purifies the stream of human life: and all social relations, as well as the arts, sciences and literature generally, are sanctified by her hallowed influence: her life penetrates every form of human existence and elevates it above the sphere of sin and the flesh. It is in the Church, and in the Church alone, that the State can reach her ideal perfection. Christianity being the highest form of humanity, we may safely say, that the Church is the perfection of the State. But whilst it is possible for the State to reach her ideal in the Church, it is not possible for the Church to reach her ideal in the State. The higher may elevate the lower; but the lower cannot elevate the higher. The river may empty itself into the sea; but the ocean cannot empty itself into the river. In the relation which we designate the State, man is under the influence of a divine plastic power, which tends to a high and holy end; but in the relation which we designate the Church, man is brought into the "holiest of holies": he is brought into the *real* and *vital* union with God in the person of his only begotten Son. Whilst, therefore, the church life, and

state life tend towards the same end, viz: the perfection of humanity in union with the Deity, it is possible only for the former to reach this end, or to carry man forward to the point of his final destination. Thus the Church life, though it transfuse and purify that of the State, nevertheless maintains its distinctive character; whilst, at the same time, the State life being thus transfused and purified does not lose its identity.

*They are distinct in mysterious unity.*

The distinctive character of the Church will also appear, when we take into view the manner in which her life is carried forward in the world, or the manner in which it forms for itself a body. The State, as we have seen, lives and grows in the way of natural generation: every one who is born into the world is born into the State, and becomes an integral part of its complex unity. The Church lives and grows in the way of *supernatural* generation. As Christ became incarnate through the supernatural and miraculous agency of the Spirit (for he was conceived by the Holy Ghost), so his divine life is carried forward in the world, or made over to us, by the same supernatural power. "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free, and have been made to drink into one spirit" 1 Cor. vii. 13. By the spirit accompanying the means of grace appointed in the Church, as for instance, the preached word and sacraments, the life of Christ is nourished in his mystical body. Organic Christianity, therefore, does not exclude the office work of the third person in the adorable Trinity. By the Spirit, the temple of God, which has Christ for its foundation, its life and chief corner-stone, is reared. As the elements of humanity are thus taken up and become the integral parts of this supernatural organism, it follows that the principle of sin and evil is excluded. The Church is a holy temple: holy in her origin, in her constitution, and her design. But the same may also be predicated of the ideal State, as a power ordained of God. Between the ideal Church, therefore, and the ideal State, there can be no contradiction nor conflict. They are in full and perfect harmony, the one in the other.

Of this internal union of Church and State, the history of their external relations presents but a distorted view; and it is

only when the ideal relation shall have been fully actualized in the real, that the external relation can be viewed as the proper expression of the internal. Sin is the cause of all contradiction and conflict. It is this that brings man into conflict with himself; it is this that brings him into contradiction with his Maker. This is the cause of all distortion and deformity; this creates the opposition between Church and State. History presents to our view a four-fold form of relations between them. During the ages of primitive Christianity, the State actually assumed the *hostile* position towards the Church. The world, brought under the dominion of idolatry, could not tolerate the pure and holy principles of Christianity. The civil powers were arrayed against the infant Church. Persecution raged in all the terrors of fire and sword. But the superior power of the Church clothed in the armour of God, not in carnal weapons, soon appeared in signal triumph over the power of darkness; the fires of persecution were quenched in the blood of martyrs; the hostile sword stained with the blood of the saints falls powerless from the hands of the cruel oppressors. The regal authority and power of the Church come to be more extensively felt and acknowledged. Under the reign of Constantine already, Christianity became the prevailing state religion. Though the Church and State constituted, as before, two organic wholes, they sustain to each other in a more eminent degree the relations of mutual action and reaction. During the former period the church life, in the exercise of its peculiar power to overcome opposition, and to assimilate to itself everything congenial with its own nature, took to itself a peculiar form and shape; for it is the peculiar characteristic of Christianity, that it can live and grow under the most adverse circumstances and oppressive relations. It is to be expected, therefore, that, by the change of external relation from the hostile to the friendly, which was effected by the transition of the Emperors from Paganism to Christianity, the church organization would be greatly modified. As might be expected, the supreme magistrates, who are now members of the Church and participate in her affairs, would be naturally inclined to transfer the relation they had stood in to the Pagan state religion, over to their relation to the Christian Church. "They are here met, however," as

observed by Dr. Neander, "by that independent spirit of the Church, which, in the course of three centuries, had been developing itself, and acquiring a determinate shape; which would make them see that Christianity could not, like Paganism, be subordinated to the political interest." "There had in fact arisen in the Church," according to the same distinguished historian, "in the previous period, a false theocratical theory, originating, not in the essence of the Gospel, but in the confusion of the religious constitutions of the Old and New Testament, which grounding itself on the idea of a visible priesthood, belonging to the essence of the Church and governing the Church, brought along with it an uncristian opposition of the spiritual to the secular power, and which might easily result in the formation of a sacerdotal state, subordinating the secular to itself in a false and outward way." Excepting Valentinian II, the emperors entertained precisely that view of the Church, which was presented to them by tradition; having no judgment of their own, they were born along by the dominant spirit."

This theocratical theory was the prevailing one in the time of Constantine. Viewing the Church as a divine institution built on Christ and the Apostles, in which nothing could be altered by the arbitrary will of man, he regarded the voice of the Church as the voice of God. "Thus, when in the year 314, an appeal was made from the Episcopal tribunal to the Imperial decision, he declared: "The sentence of the bishops must be regarded as the sentence of Christ himself."

It was, however, when the Patriarchal reign of the Church, which is now introduced, passed over into the Papal, that it becomes a settled principle that the Church is to govern the State. In the time of Gregory VII., the subordination of the State to the Church was so deeply and extensively felt that the kings were obliged to acknowledge that they derived their authority to reign from the Pope. This is illustrated by the results of the memorable contest that arose between Henry IV. and Pope Gregory VII. Hence the numerous instances of kings and princes acknowledging their inferiority to the Chief Pontiff by holding his stirrup until he would mount his horse. This theocratical view, according to which the Church is to govern

the world, it must be owned, is not very far from the scriptural idea. The distortion, however, consists in this, that the life of the Church not being fully developed in her own constitution, and the civil and social relations of human life not being sanctified by the spirit of Christianity, the State not being taken up into the living *organism* of the Church, the ecclesiastical dominion of the latter over the former is nothing more than a "*Jewish yoke*;" it is more or less oppressive and unhallowed in its character. Hence there must necessarily be a reaction: and accordingly, after the Reformation of the sixteenth century, we find the Church under the dominion of the State.

In some countries, indeed, she is viewed as nothing more than a police system to keep the masses of the people under proper restraint as a kind of an instrumentality that may be most successfully employed to secure the obedience of subjects to civil law and authority. Let us turn to England for illustration. According to the statute book of this country, "The king, his heirs, &c., shall be taken, accepted, and reputed the only supreme head of the Church of England, . . . and shall order, and correct, restrain, and amend all such errors, heresies, abuses, offences, contempts, and enormities, which by any manner of spiritual authority or jurisdiction may be restrained." . . . Archbishops, bishops, archdeacons, and other ecclesiastical persons, have no manner of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, but by and from the Royal Crown.\*

The idea that the ministers of the Christian church should receive their appointments from a worldly Prince, or that the Church should, in any sense, be in slavish subjection to the State, is most painful to the christian consciousness. The fourth and last form of relationship that comes to our view in history, between the Church and the State, is the independent, or, for instance, in our own country, where government offers the Church protection, and accedes to her the right to govern herself according to the laws of her own constitution. As Americans, it is natural for us to suppose that this form is far superior to any of

\* Not having access to the original, we have been obliged to take this quotation second-handed from the book of Baptist W. Noel, on the Union of Church and State.

those previously specified ; and this too, is in perfect accordance with our ideas of historical development and progress. To place the Church in subordination to the State, as in England, though our political structure rest upon far more liberal and christian principles, or, to place the State under the dominion of the Church, in the sense of the middle period, must certainly be regarded as a retrograde movement. At the present stage of the world's history, therefore, we should most heartily acquiesce in the existing relation of Church and State in our country. It must be evident at a single glance that, as the Church and State are not *internally united*, as their ideal relation has not been fully realized in an outward form, the Church is as little prepared to take the reins of State government, as the State is to undertake the management of ecclesiastical affairs. Let us suppose that, in her present divided state, the right were acceded to the Church to govern the world, what a painful scene of discord and conflict must we not witness ? When the Roman Catholic Church, the most ancient of all, the only true church of God in the world, would naturally claim the presidential chair : Then the Episcopal Church, which is more ancient still, having only evaded the errors and abuses of the Papacy, and which is also the only true Church, would, of course, be entitled to the chief magistracy. The Episcopalian form of government, however, is most warmly disputed by the Presbyterians, whose form of government claims to be the most Scriptural, the most ancient and withal the most republican. The Lutheran Church, too, as the oldest daughter of the Reformation, would naturally step forward and press the claim of priority. And all the Methodists in the land, raising the shout :—"The reformation of Wesley far more glorious than even that of Luther ?" would appear in formidable array. The Seceder, the Baptist, the Winebrennerian, and many other sects, having inscribed upon their banners, "The only true Church of God," would be seen going up to Washington city, each claiming possession of the White House. The German Reformed Church, always too modest and slow to claim and take care of her own, we do not suppose would be found in the number.

But when, in the glorious future, the divisions of Zion shall all be healed, when all believers shall be baptized by their only

proper name—"Christian"; when they shall all be one, as Christ and the Father are one; when the Church shall be *one* in reality as she is *one* in idea; and when she shall have gathered up into her own constitution, animated and sanctified by her own hallowed life and spirit, all the forms and relations of human life, it becomes an interesting question: "Where then will be the State?" and "What the form of her existence?" According to our theory, she *cannot* have become extinct; but she will be found in the free and holy service of the Church. The form of her outward existence, we, of course, cannot foretell. Could we determine the form of the future Church, we might venture a conjecture; but even this is concealed from our view. But if our view be correct, that the ideal State and the ideal Church are *one*, it must follow that in the end they will be one in an outward form. The State fellowship, or communion, will be elevated into the higher form of the Church communion. The Regal power of the State will be one with that of the Church, when "Christ shall reign king of nations as he now reigns king of saints;" the civil powers, which were ordained of God, shall be gathered back into the hands of his only begotten Son, and shall be exercised in harmonious union with his glorious reign, whether personal or spiritual, in the Church. The educational function of the State will also be elevated and become one with that of the Church, which is now the only infallible interpreter of the truth, whether revealed in a natural or in a supernatural way. And every form of State religion will then be one with the pure and holy worship, whose incense shall ever come up acceptably before the throne of the great Eternal.

Christ is now (in the full meaning of the expression) "all and in all." The little stone, which was cut out without hands, having smitten the images of iron, of clay and brass, has now become a great mountain, and fills the whole earth. The small grain of mustard seed has now become a great tree, whose wide spreading branches overshadow the entire globe, and all people, of every kindred, tongue and climate, take shelter under it. We end in the "new heavens, and the new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness."

HAGERSTOWN, Md.

M. K.

## ART. XLIII.—WISDOM'S VOICE.

MAN should be wise. All nature has a tongue  
To teach him knowledge, were his soul but strung  
    To catch the lesson poured upon his ear.  
O'er the broad world the rays of truth are flung,  
To show him things in their own proper light,  
    Were but the spirit eye unscaled and clear,  
To read their silent meaning as it might.

All breathes with language eloquent and pure;  
Tells him of change; warns him how little sure  
    The light foundations of his worldly state;  
And bids him seek a footing more secure,  
Ere yet the slippery confidence may slide,  
    And the lost spirit, roused, alas, too late,  
Sink in its strength, and perish in its pride.

The solid earth he treads upon, that seems  
Immoveable; its forests, plains and streams;  
    Its seas, and everlasting hills sublime;  
All have a voice to chide his empty dreams.  
They tell of generations swept away;  
    Themselves coeval with the birth of time  
Yet rushing always towards the same decay.

The sun speaks to him from his awful height,  
And the soft moon throned on the realm of night.  
The stars look down upon him too, as though  
They sought to woo him, with their gentle light,  
Upward to God. The heavens, as they shine,  
    Make earth seem empty, narrow, dark and low  
And point the spirit to her home divine.

The winds, the clouds, the ever-varying sky;  
Hours, days, nights, months and seasons, as they fly,  
    In quick succession, through their circling range;  
The summer leaves that fade, and flowers that die;  
The growth of ages, crumbling in decay;  
    All warn us loudly of our coming change  
And urge our feet to take the heavenly way.

The mighty wreck that still is going on  
O'er time's broad sea; whole generations gone;  
    Cities of men, and empires, buried deep  
In its dark wave; the desolation done  
In one brief age; the pride of nations fled;  
    The mighty hurried to their last great sleep;  
States rent; thrones fallen; living millions dead;

Life's rolling, heaving, ever changing ground ;  
The havoc years are making all around ;  
The altered show that meets the sight each day ;  
The places vacant where our friends were found ;  
Familiar forms fast sinking from our eyes ;  
The graves so thickly strown upon our way ;—  
Sure in a world like this, man *should* be wise.

N.

---

#### ART. XLIV.—PURITANISM AND THE CREED.

THE *Puritan Recorder*, one of the most respectable and widely influential religious papers in New England, has lately uttered itself on this subject, in a succession of short articles, (called forth as it would seem, in opposition to our late view of the Creed,) which we have no right entirely to overlook. We trust at the same time, that our object in noticing them, will be rightly appreciated. We should be sorry to give way to mere polemical zeal, in such a case, for its own sake. We have no quarrel specially with the Recorder ; and it is not in our mind at all, to challenge it to any sort of public argument or debate. That would require a common audience ; which it is vain for us, of course, at this time, to ask or expect. Before the amphitheatre of the Recorder's public, we can be heard, for the most part, only in such form as the paper itself may see fit to allow ; and we have had experience enough to know, that even where our denominational religious papers are least disposed to be consciously unfair, no sort of justice is to be hoped for, ordinarily, in this way. Our interest is in the subject, under its general aspect, and as related to theology in its broad view. We make use of the Recorder as an *occasion*, simply, for bringing home to the consideration of our readers a vastly significant interest, in a connection of actual life, near at hand, such as is suited to fix upon

it their earnest attention. There is no good reason, at all events, why a Review like ours should limit its critical interest to what is published in the form of pamphlets and books. A large part of our literature, at present, appears in the form of newspapers. The weekly religious press, especially, has come to be of far more account for our theology, so far as we can be said to have any that is living and not dead, than all the books now produced in its service. These are in general so mechanical, that they carry in them very little power either for bad or good. To understand the actual religious life of the country, theoretic as well as practical, we must commune with the religious newspapers of the different sects. They, indeed, generally disclaim scientific theology; aiming simply, as they say, to be practical; but in their own way they show themselves ready enough, notwithstanding, to settle all theological questions in the most summary off-hand style; and with the advantage of their position, the authority thus assumed is allowed very generally to prevail. We are bound, accordingly, to have regard to them, if we would deal with the theological life of the country in a living way. A newspaper paragraph may be of more account at times, as a text for religious discussion, than a whole sermon, or a large lettered duodecimo of three hundred and fifty pages, manufactured to order according to previous fashion and rule.

In writing upon the Creed, we ventured to say, not without hesitation in our own mind, that Puritanism is constitutionally at variance with this ancient rule, and if left to itself would fall on a very different formula to represent its faith. The hesitation we felt in saying this, arose not from any doubt of its being the truth, but from the apprehension of its seeming to be a hard saying to others, who might not see the truth of it at once, and so be led to think our judgment unkind and harsh; just as some have considered it harsh, that we should affirm a similar falling away from the faith of the sixteenth century in the case of the holy sacraments; as though the question were one of courtesy only, and had nothing to do at all with stern historical reality. We were afraid that many might consider it a slander to charge Puritanism with being in conflict with the Creed, when it is still willing to accept the form of it at times, as orthodox and good;

the circumstance being overlooked, that in every such case the Creed is quietly filled with a new sense materially different from that which belonged to it in the beginning.\* We are now, however, happily discharged of all this concern. The Puritan Recorder, in the name of Puritanism, and with intelligent insight, as it would seem, into the true nature of the question at issue, openly and boldly accepts our representation as fully correct. The Creed, in its genuine and original sense, is no true type, we are told, of the present *orthodoxy* of New England. Whatever traditional respect may have been allowed to it in the beginning, it has fallen on all sides into disuse, and is notoriously out of date. All this too is proclaimed an improvement in our general Christianity; for the Creed turns out, on close examination, to be at war with the Bible, and the use of it is perilous to the interests of evangelical religion. The Puritan Recorder, in this case, is no mean witness. We are bound to respect its testimony; we do respect it in fact; and we wish it to be listened to seriously and solemnly, throughout the length and breadth of the American Church.

"The experience of two centuries has shown," says the Recorder, "that the Creed and Puritanism have not a kindred spirit. The first Puritans did not discard what is called the Apostles' Creed, but expressly allowed its use, and by a sort of courtesy, gave it a place beside their formularies and catechisms. It even had a place in the New England Primer. But its life and spirit never entered into the life of the Puritan churches. And, consequently, it now exists among us as some fossil relic of by-gone ages. And we look with a sort of pity upon those who are laboring to infuse life

\* "Dr. N., who appears to be chief cyclops, and forger of thunder-bolts for what is called the Mercersburg Theology, has turned his one eye, with vulcanian glare, towards us; and launched his lightnings at our heads, for a supposed want of respect for that venerable symbol, the so-called Apostles' Creed. In rebuking the flippancy of a sciolist, [Dr. Bushnell,] who had spoken as if it were an undoubted fact, that this ancient form was drawn up by the Apostles, we had said that it 'was no more an apostolical invention, than was Christmas pie.' In the sense in which we used the words, Dr. N., like any man of ordinary learning, fully accords with us. And we hold, as firmly as he does, that the Creed is truly apostolical in regard to the 'divine substance of its contents,' and 'as representing from the beginning the one unvarying faith of the universal Christian world.' There are other creeds, which, in the same sense, are no less apostolical."—*Boston Christian Observatory, for Sept., 1849:* This is well, as far as it goes; but it tallies badly with the Puritan Recorder.

into it, and to set it up as a living ruler in the Church. We are free to confess, that this Creed has forsaken the Puritans, and gone over to become the idol and strength of all branches of anti-puritanism.

"And there are good reasons; for Puritanism builds on the Scriptures, and this Creed teaches, in several respects, anti-scriptural doctrines. It is true, that most of it is capable of a sense which harmonizes with the Scriptures, and so the Puritans received it, in a sense consonant with their theology—either leaving out, or putting a strained sense upon the passage which asserts that Christ descended into hell. But it is neither safe nor expedient to receive such a document, in such a perverted sense. For the document once being admitted, and its authority being made to bind the conscience, then the way is open for those who hold the errors held by its authors, to plead that we are bound to receive it in the sense which its authors gave to it, and this makes it an instrument of corrupting the faith of the gospel.

"But what are the heretical points of this Creed? We shall have space in this article for only one, and that is the doctrine of purgatory, as taught in the assertion that Christ descended into hell."—*Pur. Rec.*, Aug. 23, 1849.

This particular charge of teaching the doctrine of Purgatory, the article then goes on to substantiate and settle in its own brief way, without the least regard to true history, by a few hop-step-and-jump combinations, within the bounds of a paragraph measuring about one-fourth part of a single column of the paper in which it appears. Two other errors, one latent in the clause "Catholic Church," the other peeping forth from the "Communion of Saints," are laid over for subsequent dissection.

In the Recorder of the following week, Aug. 30, we have another article, nearly a column long, disposing of the second of these last mentioned errors in equally sweeping and summary style. Modern evangelical Christians, we are told, have no occasion for the clause "Communion of Saints," in their forms of belief. "The meaning which they would fit to it, is not one sufficiently prominent to have a place in so brief a confession of faith. And it is very clear that the unknown authors of the Apostles' Creed had a meaning for it, and a use for it, which we have not." And then we have historical hypothesis again substituted for historical fact, to show that the true sense of it is to be found in the superstitions of the Roman Church. "If we suppose that the Romish doctrine of the intercession of departed

saints for men upon earth, and of the efficacy of prayers addressed by us to the saints in heaven, and of the efficacy of prayers offered for the dead, had obtained at the time when this phrase was added to the Creed, then we see an adequate reason for its addition." This *if*, made good by the violent assumption, that the article was no part of the primitive faith of the Church, but a device added to it somewhere along in the fourth century, (a fact demanded, and so made sure, by the necessities of the hypothesis itself,) proves strong enough to hurry us, by a few strokes of the pen, into the convenient conclusion, that it was brought in purely and solely for the purpose of covering this general Roman fancy. "And *if so*, the use of the Creed by us is a snare, since, though we may find a different and true sense, which will fit the words, the historic sense has superior claims, which will not fail to be felt by many minds, that attach an authority, not to say sacredness, to the venerated document."

The first article in the Recorder of the next week, Sept. 6, calls our attention again to the "heretical points of the Creed," under the somewhat startling caption: **THE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH A FIGMENT.** In repeating the clause, *I believe in the holy catholic Church*, the early Puritan, we are told, wist not what he said. They suit not the faith of a Puritan. "Let him attach his own sense to the words, and he can utter them. But then the utterance comes from him with a sort of foreign accent and unnatural constraint. If the term 'catholic church' embrace all the elect or true believers, in all places and all times, the living and the dead, and those not yet born—that is, the spiritual or invisible church, the mystical body of Christ—very well. But if it mean that the visible church is a 'holy catholic church'—an organic body, embracing all professing Christians as one whole, in one organic brotherhood—it has no warrant in Scripture. In the light of the New Testament, the idea of a *catholic visible church* is intrinsically impossible and absurd." Christ himself, we are gravely informed, "organized no church," but committed the "organizing of *churches*" to the apostles. This they did after the day of Pentecost. The churches thus organized, however, were all equally original, independent, and complete in and by themselves. "They were not splinters nor fractions of

churches, but whole *churches*." In the Recorder for Sept. 13, the subject is resumed, under the caption: "The False Theory of the Visible Church a Hindrance to Christian Union." Here the Creed is charged with teaching "the phantom of an organic catholicity of the visible Church"; on which account, says the Recorder, as such a church "exists not in fact, nor in the theory of the New Testament, it is not for us to recite such a creed." It kills "the principle of the essential independency of the churches," and makes sectarianism and schism to be a sin. Only let the public mind be well charged with this principle of atomistic christianity, and the misery of our sect system is at once in a great measure brought to an end. It is the notion of catholicity, as we have it in the Creed, that leads men to declaim against what they call the "sect spirit." "Let that phantom go to the winds," and we shall see that individuals may form a new church at any time to suit themselves, without prejudice to Christ's house. "Let the principle of independency expand to its just proportions in the public mind, and the right of Christians thus to organize will be generally conceded." Then, too, the evils of sectarian division will in a large measure cease; "the mutual irritation and odium of the sects comes of this false assumption," that the Church should be outwardly one. The same false theory it is, which originates the reproach brought against the Church by the surrounding world, on account of its sectarianism. "Just remove the phantom which dwells in the imagination as some sacred thing, and no violence will be supposed to have been done to a sacred thing, when, like Abram and Lot, Christians separate for the avoidance of strife. Take away the idol, and no sacrilege will be committed in mutilating it, and no weak consciences will be defiled in eating what is offered in sacrifice to it." This may be taken, certainly, as a short and easy cure for all sorts of schism; though one can hardly fail to see in it a certain sort of analogy with the style, in which our Socialists and Radical Reformers generally affect to rid themselves of such ethical and religious obstructions as happen to come in *their* way. Remove, for instance, the phantom of holy matrimony, which now dwells in the imagination of men as some sacred thing, and no violence will be supposed to have been done to what is sacred, when, like

Abraham and David, Christians multiply wives or concubines to suit themselves. Take away the idol, and no sacrilege will hold against it in the form either of adultery or fornication. But what if the "idol," holy matrimony in this last case, and the holy catholic church in the other, should prove to be, in the end, no phantom at all, but the very shrine of divinity itself, set up among men to be the object of their perpetual faith and veneration? The *argumentum ab utili* is then at an end. Marriage may not be set aside, to accommodate a community of libertines; the Church may not be shorn of its original inborn attributes, to suit the humor of sects.

The Puritan Recorder, of course, assumes throughout, that the Church is no divine institution, in the form asserted by the Creed. But this at last remains simply an *assumption*. It is not proved. The writer has a certain preconception of the nature of the Church, which he finds to be contradicted by the theory of the Creed; whereupon he expects us at once to accept *his* preconception, on the authority of his own word, as the true sense of the New Testament, and so to jump with him to the conclusion, that the theory of the **Creed** is unscriptural, fantastic and false. We are not prepared to bow to such logic as this. The whole assumption here taken against the **Creed**, is gratuitous and untrue. The *idea* of the Church presented in the **Creed**, falls back historically to the very cradle of the Christian faith; full as much so as the *idea* of the incarnation itself. The one mystery in truth grows forth from the other; the *idea* of the Church has its necessary root in the *idea* of Christ. And this entire faith, of course, then, meets us in the New Testament. The conception of the Church, as a new universal or catholic creation, starting in Christ, and destined to take up the world finally into its sphere, underlies the Christian revelation from beginning to end. This conception involves, too, throughout, all the attributes which are ascribed to the Church in the **Creed**; unity, sanctity, catholicity; for these come not from abroad, but have their necessity in the nature of the conception itself. The Church is by its constitution one and not many; and however it may fail to actualize its own interior sense in this form, in any given stage of its history, it can never renounce this sense as

something false, but must still labor towards its full actualization as the only end in which it can be regarded as complete. So as regards holiness ; and so also as regards catholicity. The Church can never, without infidelity, renounce her vocation and right to be the absolute mistress at last of all spheres of our human existence, however far short she may fall at present of the power that is needed to make good such universal pretension. This, of course, implies *visibility* ; however the Church may be hindered for ages in her effort to come to a complete externalization of her divine life, as the true last sense of the world, yet to this it must assuredly come in the end, if she be indeed this last true sense ; and the whole process of this effort itself, moreover, must include throughout the character of visibility as far as it goes. All this, we say, lies in the New Testament, as well as in the faith of the primitive christian world, expressed in the Apostles' Creed ; and it is a mere play of fancy, accordingly, when the Puritan Recorder imagines the contrary, and so requires us to give up the article of the Creed as a pious figment.

This, however, by the way. It is not our business here, to interpret the New Testament, or vindicate the Creed. We wish simply, to fix attention on the general fact now in hand, the discrepancy which is acknowledged to hold between the true sense of this ancient symbol and Puritanism. It will be seen at once, that the difference, as presented by the Recorder, is very material. Three points are particularly singled out, in proof and illustration of its force, namely, the descent to hades, the communion of saints, and the idea of the holy catholic church ; but the difference itself is plainly of a general character, and must be regarded as extending to the entire Creed ; for this is not made up of disconnected fragmentary parcels, but forms a single whole in harmony with itself throughout. The Recorder indeed denies this, and declares itself out of patience with us, (July 26.) for assuming, without proof, that "the Creed is the product of the first ages of Christianity," and that it is to be considered at all "rotund and full" in its constitution ; quoting Sir Peter King, to show that it *was* a fragmentary production, after the third century. But there is no good reason here, we think, for getting out of patience on *that* side, however it may be on ours. We

have never pretended that the Creed came round and full, as it now stands, from the age of the Apostles, or that it was not made to undergo some variations and additions, in the progress of its early history. We have taken pains to say just the contrary ; for the purpose of planting its authority on better ground, in the conception of its organic derivation from a central principle, in the faith of the universal early Church. We have said that it *grew* forth from the primary christian consciousness, the sense of Christ as the ground and fountain of the new creation ; in which view, it might be of more or less volume, and admit many varieties of expression, without any change in its essential substance ; just as the ten commandments gather themselves up at last into love to God and love to man. The Creed represents truly the faith of the universal Church in the first centuries ; nobody pretends that the different forms of it before the Council of Nice, involved any material divergencies of belief ; and the whole stands before us in the end as an inwardly symmetrical and complete system, shooting forth from a common root, and revealing in all its parts the power of a common life. This inward, constitutional unity of the Creed, which is something very different from the unity of a catechism or a watch, we have endeavored to establish by an actual analysis of its form and plan ; and we have not met with any attempt yet to show our analysis wrong. The Creed here speaks for itself. We need no outward testimony to prove its unity. All the case requires is, that we should rightly study the structure in its own forms and proportions. In this view, its roundness and wholeness are such as to make themselves felt by all serious persons. The Recorder itself, evidently feels this constitutional unity of the Creed, even while trying to make it out a bundle of fragments ; and it is on this ground, accordingly, we have the candid and free admission, that the symbol, as a whole, falls not in with the proper life of Puritanism. This is undoubtedly correct. The variation may be more directly apprehensible at some points than it is at others ; but it runs through the entire scope and structure of the Creed. *Its* genius is not that of Puritanism. The two "have not a kindred spirit." Their standpoint is different. The descent to hades, the communion of saints, the holy catholic church, we are told,

belong not to the Puritan circle of thought, and must have a new sense forced upon them to sit even in a stiff way on Puritan lips. But they belong plainly enough to the circle of thought embodied in the Creed, and fall in naturally and easily with all its other articles. All these, then, must have a sense in the Creed, which is not fully owned in the same form by Puritanism. The christological confession holds under a different view. The forgiveness of sins, and the resurrection of the body, are thought of in different relations. The whole inward habit of the ancient faith, is not such as to fit at all the habit of the modern faith. Puritanism is not at home in the Creed: feels awkward in the use of it; prefers quietly to drop the use of it altogether. That is not the mould in which its faith has been cast. Its orthodoxy puts things together in another way.

But surely now the open acknowledgment of such a fact as this deserves attention. For only see how much it involves. The Creed expresses the faith, the primary religious mind or consciousness of the universal ancient Church. In this form, Christianity took its historical rise, in the living heart of the Christian world. The sense of the mystery ran into this fundamental shape from the beginning, and was made to underlie thus the whole subsequent life of the Church. All later symbols were held to be of force, only as they rested on the first. The old catholic christianity throughout had its basis in the consciousness expressed by the Creed. Its fathers, martyrs, confessors and saints, would all have shrunk with dismay from the thought of holding it in any other form. The Reformation again planted itself professedly on the same ground, the faith of the New Testament, as set forth fundamentally in the Apostles' Creed. Both the Protestant confessions, in the beginning, the Reformed as well as the Lutheran, stood here upon common ground. Protestantism was held to be, not a new faith extracted from the Bible, but the old Christian faith itself, purged from Roman corruptions; and the ancient symbols were taken, accordingly, as its necessary ground and rule, from which it was counted unlawful and unsafe to depart. The confessions and catechisms of the sixteenth century, all do homage to the Apostles' Creed, as the primary text and outline of evangelical christianity. What would

Luther have said to the suggestion, that the Creed and Protestantism had not a kindred spirit? How would such an assertion have fallen on the mind of Melancthon or Calvin? Beyond all controversy, Protestantism in its original form, supposed itself to be of one mind with the Creed, and would have shuddered at the thought of treating it simply as "the fossil relic of by-gone ages." Our modern *Puritanism*, then, by its own confession in the case before us, is something materially different from all previous Christianity, both Catholic and Protestant. The Creed does not suit it, and cannot be used by it without unnatural constraint. This, indeed, was not at once clear to the genius of Puritanism itself. It started with the idea that it still loved the Creed, and could frame its mouth easily enough to recite it on fit occasion; "by a sort of courtesy, gave it a place beside its formularies and catechisms;" allowed it even to figure, for a time, in the New England Primer. But the water and the oil refused at last to mix. The Creed lost its voice, and wasted gradually into a shadow. "Its life and spirit never entered into the life of the Puritan churches;" and now the secret is fairly out. "We are free to confess," says the respectable editor of the *Recorder*, "that this Creed has forsaken the Puritans, and gone over to become the idol and strength of all branches of anti-puritanism."

It is plain, then, that Puritanism, in this view, is at war at once with the Fathers and with the Reformers, with early Christianity and with the Christianity of the sixteenth century. However it may agree with them in many points of doctrine, abstractly stated, its apprehension of Christianity as a whole, the organism of its faith, the standpoint of its religious contemplation, and so, of course, the relations and bearings under which it sees all particular truths, come before us with a quite different character. Puritanism is not original Protestantism. It is an advance on this; a real breaking away from its first life; Protestantism, we may say, self-stimulated into a sort of "second growth." The simple fact that it allows no room whatever for the *Lutheran* principle, which in the beginning divided the interest of Protestantism with the Reformed, is of itself enough to prove this for any reflecting mind. It is proved here, also, however, by its want of affinity and sympathy with the Creed. Puritanism is ready to acknowl-

edge that the spirit of the Creed, which is the spirit of all earlier Christianity, is against it and not to its taste. It glories in setting history here at full defiance. It is *independent* in all respects, and able to stand without help on its own bottom.

We are reminded, however, that Puritanism in all this exercise of independence, is still the dutiful disciple of the Bible. What is history against the word of God; what is the voice of the Creed, in comparison with the oracles of inspiration? Why make account of Fathers and Reformers, in the presence of the Scriptures? "Puritanism," says the Recorder, "builds on the Scriptures, and this Creed teaches, in several respects, anti-scriptural doctrines." We are charged with denying that the Bible is a complete rule of faith, because we insist on the authority of the Creed; nay, the "main characteristic" of our theology, its "parent feature," is made to be an idolatrous devotion to this symbol, as a sort of rival to the written word. There would be full as much reason, by the way, to resolve our system into an idolatry to the idea of sacramental grace. We are quoted as saying: "The Bible is not the *principle* of Christianity, nor yet the rock on which the Church was built;" but what we say immediately after, is not allowed to follow: "The one principle of Christianity, the true and proper fountain of its being, is the person of Christ; not any written account or notion of his person, but the actual living revelation of it, as a fact, in the history of the world." This position, of course, is not to be contradicted. Still we have the same changes rung perpetually on the old string. "Puritanism draws its life directly from the Bible and the Holy Ghost," aside from all creeds or traditions. "No stopping place here between Puritan liberty and Romish inquisition; that is, between liberty to think, and the suppression of thought by force." All this, we are told, is fully and forever settled in New England. "So deeply has the conviction that the Bible is the only rule of faith, seated itself in the Puritan mind; so clearly have the reason and force of this principle been revealed to the descendants of the Pilgrims; and so fully are we all possessed of the right of private judgment in religion; that we should seem to be laboring the proof of self-evident truths, if we were to go into argument here" (*Pur. Rec. Aug. 2*).

It is a blessed thing, certainly, and at times, too, saves much trouble, for "every man to be fully persuaded in his own mind." The case, however, is one that allows liberty and inquiry ; and we do not ourselves find it by any means so clear, as these wholesale positions imply. We beg leave, respectfully, to reiterate our word : The Bible is not the principle of Christianity, nor its foundation ; this is a fact, out of the New Testament, before it and beyond it, which has its *principium* in the living person of Christ ; and which, in this form, must rule the interpretation of the Bible for every true believer, and *not* be itself ruled, through the Bible, simply by his own mind. Will this be denied even in New England ? We trust not. And yet, in the face of it, what becomes of all this talk about private judgment and the Bible, as the *sole* factors of the christian faith ? Christianity itself, as something far more than any private judgment, must assist me to the true sense of the Scriptures, or I shall study them to little purpose. The only question, then, is, where this help is to be found. Puritanism refers us for it at once to the Holy Ghost. Very good ; we too say, only those who are taught by the Spirit can understand the things of the Spirit. But the question returns : Where and how are we placed in communication thus with the Holy Ghost ? Puritanism, in the case before us, assumes that the mystery takes place in a purely private way, each christian being enlightened by abrupt illapses for himself alone. This, however, we can by no means allow. It is against nature, against revelation, and against all sound philosophy. The agency of the Spirit on men, is conditioned universally by their living relations in the world, reaches them through the medium of their social and historical life, makes itself actual in and by the spiritual organism in which they are comprehended and carried. The child is illuminated as a child, and not as a full grown man ; the Hottentot as an unlettered savage, and not as a graduate of Oxford or Cambridge. To read the Bible to purpose, then, requires still more than the momentary presence of the Holy Ghost. There must be previous education, a development of thought, an inward moral habit, in one word, a positive spiritual substance, to some extent, already at hand, as the fruit of history and growth, *through* which only the voice of the Spirit

can ever be heard. Will any sane mind dispute this? We think hardly. The question, then, is not, whether the Bible shall be our sole rule of faith, but with what inward posture and habit we are to come to the study of the Bible for this purpose; for it is grossly absurd to suppose, that we can ever come to it without *some* such posture and habit. Puritanism has its spiritual habit, its tradition, its theological medium, its *a priori* governing religious consciousness, in this way, just as fully as any other section of the christian world. The point here, accordingly, is in truth, not the Creed against the Bible; this last we all allow to be supreme; but the Creed against the inward habit and tradition of Puritanism, which, to our view, is something quite different. It is all idle, in such case, to raise the cry: The Bible, the Bible, the Bible of the Lord, are we. That is the very point which is to be settled. Other ages have had the Bible too, to study and follow; and it is not at once clear, why the use of it by modern New England is to be taken as infallibly right, and all other use of it, differing from this, as infallibly wrong. Every such assumption is suited rather to remind us of Paul's keen challenge to the Church at Corinth: "What! came the word of God out from you? Or came it unto you only?" Christianity is older than Puritanism; and we see no good reason, in this case, why the elder should serve the younger, or the past become nothing to make all of the present. We see no good reason, in other words, for divesting ourselves of the general consciousness of the ancient Church, as expressed in the Apostles' Creed, and putting on in place of it the consciousness or creed of modern New England, as the only sure medium of access to the true sense of the Bible. We go for private judgment too, and Protestant independence; but for this very reason we wish to secure the conditions that are most favorable to their rational exercise; and it seems to us, in this view, we confess, vastly more safe to be in union here with the general mind of the ancient Church, than to be in conflict with it through the authority of any other system. Why may not private judgment stand in the bosom of the old faith, as fully as on the outside of it? Why should our homage to the Bible be less free and independent in the communion of the Creed, than when we substitute for this the theological habit

of Puritanism? It comes to nothing, that Puritanism pleads in its favor the authority of the Bible, and charges the Creed with heresy. That is only its own word. Whole ages of Christianiy, thousands and tens of thousands of God's saints, the noble army of martyrs, fathers and reformers, have thought differently, with one voice proclaiming the Creed as the true and proper sense of the Scriptures, the glorious ground type of the Christian faith. A mind in no sympathy with the Creed, will, of course, not find it in the Bible; just as the Unitarian fails to find there the mystery of the Trinity, and so appeals to it as *his* witness against all other orthodox authorities. But let such sympathy prevail, and at once the whole case is changed; the supposed heresies of the venerable symbol brighten into glorious truths; and the Bible is found, with easy interpretation, to speak the same sense from every page. When the Puritan Recorder claims the witness of the Bible against the Creed, it simply asks us to accept beforehand its own scheme of religion, through the medium of which the Bible is made to speak what it pretends. We, for our part, protest that we find in it no such meaning whatever. On all the points urged by the Recorder, the Creed is in full harmony with the Bible.

It would be strange indeed, if the sense of Christianity in the age when the New Testament was formed, were a less sure medium for its interpretation, than a later habit of thought altogether different. The presumption here, is at once powerfully against Puritanism. The true standpoint for understanding the Bible, is that of the Creed; and any view that may be taken of it from any different position is of small force, as weighed against the light in which it is seen and read from this position. "To the law and to the testimony," by all means; but then to save the force of this appeal, we insist on coming to the rule in a right way. Let us have the Bible in the element of its own life. And where else can we rationally pretend to find this, if it be not allowed to start, at least, in the Apostles' Creed?

Whether any protest may be made against the declaration of the Puritan Recorder, on the part of the general Puritan interest itself, remains to be seen. We would fain trust, that there are many in New England as well as out of it, owning the power

of this system, on whose feelings still the declaration must fall harshly, and who will be disposed to demur to its authority. It is of itself, however, something very significant, that so far as we have heard no such protest has been uttered as yet from any quarter. Is silence here to be construed into consent? Or does it imply, at least, indifference and apathy towards the whole subject, as one of comparatively small account in any view? Such a declaration, made from any respectable source in the name of Protestantism, during the sixteenth century, would have called out, most certainly, from all sides, a loud indignant rebuke. Now it is met, at best, with passive unconcern. Congregational New England has no voice to vindicate the authority of the Creed. Presbyterianism too is silent. Were the honor of its Shorter Catechism invaded in the same way, there would be no lack of remonstrance and complaint. And yet the Creed is the *primary* Protestant symbol, of more sacredness and force, assuredly, than any catechism.\* From other non-episcopal bodies, of course, (if we may except the Reformed Dutch,) not even the most gentle protest was to be expected. It needs no proof that our sects generally, are without zeal for the *Creed*. Its historical, catholic, sacramental, mystical character, suits not their mind. There can be no veneration for the *Creed*, where there is no veneration for the *Church*.

It seems to us, however, that this is a case which is entitled to general serious consideration. We have no right to overlook it, or to pass it by as of only insignificant account. The question, whether the Apostles' Creed is of force for evangelical Protestant-

\* We have heard of one Presbyterian paper, in which the Recorder's vilification of the *Creed* was republished, without a word of exception or censure. We meet the same portentous phenomenon in the *Lutheran Observer*, Sept. 21. It is still for this model of Lutheran orthodoxy, it seems, an open question, whether the *symbolum apostolicum* teaches false doctrine or not. While some assign it a place beyond its merits, "others as learned and pious as they," charge it with heresy, "when explained agreeably to its original design and import." On this issue, "we are anxious that our readers should be made acquainted with both sides of the question, and therefore lay before them the following article on the subject, taken from the *Puritan Recorder*." The *Observer* itself thus is *non liquet*.

ism, however it be answered, is a very great question, which ought not to go without a clear and full response, that may be heard and laid to heart on all sides. The Creed is a theological unit. It cannot be taken to pieces, without destruction. From its own standpoint and posture, all its articles flow with easy necessity as the proclamation of a single fact. In this form it is the primitive type of Christianity, the mould in which the faith of the gospel first took living shape in the Church. It was so acknowledged at the Reformation, as well as in all ages before. Now, we are told, it has become a fossil relic, with the spirit of which Puritanism owns no inward affinity or fellowship. Is this confession to be accepted as truth? If not, the occasion certainly requires that it should be met with some open contradiction. Puritanism should let the world know, that the Creed has *not* forsaken it, and is *not* still to be counted a dead letter only in its old confessional Primer. If, on the other hand, the confession be accepted as true, the occasion requires that a fact so strange and startling should be openly explained and made to appear right. Silence here is wholly out of place. A great theological interest is at stake. Here are two *minds*, two theological habits, the old catholic consciousness and the modern Puritan consciousness, "having no kindred spirit," each of which claims to be, not at once the Bible, (neither the Creed nor the New England Primer is *that*,) but still the only true and safe preparation for coming to the sense of the Bible, the necessary " $\piον\ στω$ " for the right understanding of its divine contents. Which are we to follow? Puritanism acknowledges its own novelty, and yet requires us to quit the Creed, and cast ourselves upon its independent separate guidance instead, as the infallible rule and measure of Christianity. **I** build upon the Scriptures, it exclaims; the Creed is a human production, and teaches false doctrine; follow *me*. Truly, a very great and solemn demand! Let it be heard with all becoming seriousness and respect. Still, we tremble at the thought of such a deep rupture with the old Christian consciousness, and venture to ask: By what authority doest *thou* this thing, and who *gave* thee *such* authority? And this question, we say, demands a calm and clear answer; a scientific answer; an answer that may

satisfy at once the yearnings of pious feeling, and the necessities of earnest theological thought.

Again we say, in conclusion, we are anxious that the *animus* of this article should not be misunderstood. Our aim is not war, but God's free truth in the spirit of love and peace. We need no angry voice, to remind us of the vast achievements and high merits of Puritanism. All that is fully and constantly before our mind. We need no outward advocate, to urge the force of its peculiar claims. We know what they are, by inborn constitutional sense. The hardest Puritan we have to do with always, is the one we carry, by birth and education, in our own bosom. But the misery of it is, for our quiet, that the Catholic is there too, and will not be at rest. In other words, we are forced to do homage to *both* tendencies, and have no power, like many, to resign ourselves wholly to the separate beck of one. According to the Boston Recorder, "there is no stopping place between Puritan liberty and Romish inquisition, between liberty to think and the suppression of thought by force." But just this we are by no means prepared to believe.\* On the contrary, we are deeply persuaded that the sense of authority and the exercise of free thought go hand in hand together, and cannot be disjoined in the moral world without deep prejudice to truth. We are deeply persuaded too, in the case before us, that Catholicism and Puritanism both enter of right into the constitution of Christianity, and that neither can legitimately exclude the other. The problem of their true and proper union, is indeed one of no common difficulty; the great problem, as it would seem, for the new era of Christianity, which is now so generally supposed to be at hand. The inmost wants of the time, however, cry aloud for its solution. Blind outward authority, and mere private

\* Romanism, in its genuine shape, takes the same ground; only planting itself on the contrary pole of the antithesis, and requiring us to accept our faith in an *ab extra* way from the hands of the Pope. Both poles, thus disjoined, come to very much the same falsehood in the end. This we hope to show more fully in our promised review of Brownson's Quarterly; and as many seem to be a little impatient with the delay of this article, we here take occasion to say, that it will appear, God willing, in our next number. Good reasons have stood in the way of its appearing sooner.

judgment, are alike insufficient as a key to the Bible. What we desire is, that this should be acknowledged, and a true conciliation at least aimed at between the great tendencies, which are here placed in opposition and conflict. It is not by the simple assertion of its own life, but in *so* asserting this life as to leave no room for the other side of religion, that Puritanism seems to us to be too often in fault. When it claims to be at once the sum and substance and end of all Christianity, the absolute sense of the Bible, and requires that all other systems, the old Catholic, the primitive Protestant, the thinking of all other times and of all other lands, shall be tested and tried by itself, or by the Bible to its particular mind, (which is just the same thing,) we cannot but feel that the claim is at war with all reason and right. Such exclusiveness involves vast wrong to the cause itself, in whose favor it is thus urged. Puritanism is bound to acknowledge the rights of other tendencies, the Catholic, the Lutheran, the original Reformed, for instance, if it would have its own acknowledged, and so coöperate efficiently in the great task of bringing Christianity to its last universal form. Let it do this, and we are ready always to sit respectfully at its feet, and drink in wisdom from its lips. We reserve to ourselves, of course, in this posture, the right of free contradiction, where it may seem to be needed; and we shall not insult it, by supposing its granite nature so soft that any such freedom can ever require an apology.

J. W. N.

---

#### POSTSCRIPT.

THOUGH in no very immediate relation to the subject of the foregoing article, we may as well notice here as anywhere else, if we are to notice at all, the sharp dissatisfaction expressed by the Puritan Recorder, and in another quarter also, with the article in our last number, referring to the case of Mr. Lesley. It has been held up to reproach, as a direct vindication of this gentleman's opinions and course; and the attempt is made, on this

ground, to insinuate against all connected, whether nearly or remotely, with the Mercersburg Review, a general sympathy with error and a wish to set aside church authority and the binding force of creeds!

We are sorry, that any occasion should have been furnished by this article, however innocently, for those who seek occasion, thus to pervert and misrepresent our true position, for the purpose of keeping out of sight the questions of deep practical concern, that are really at issue between us and themselves. Our interest in these, on the score simply of their general theological significance, is so sincerely honest and earnest, that we are always made to feel sick at heart, when we find any merely personal or party reference thrust forward into their place, and some accidental purely subordinate question allowed to run away thus with the attention that should be confined to the main interest in debate. We have no concern for the cause of Mr. Lesley whatever, and no wish, certainly, to endorse or vindicate his views in any way; we are very certain too, that nothing of this sort can be legitimately saddled on the particular article to which this notice refers; still we regret, for the reason just stated, that more care was not taken to anticipate and shut out more effectually the possibility of its being abused into any such wrong and injurious sense. We hope to profit by the lesson, and shall try to bear in mind that we need the wisdom of the serpent, no less than the simplicity of the dove, to keep at bay the *odium theologicum*, with which unfortunately we are called too often to deal as the substitute of zeal for the truth.

It is not true that the article in question "enters with all zeal into the case of Mr. Lesley and his come-outer church," and makes common cause with the man and his measures. It explicitly says the contrary, and condemns the separatistic position he has allowed himself to take. The design of the article, as any candid mind may easily see, was not at all to support Mr. Lesley in his theological or ecclesiastical position; he is only an accident in the case; the true thing proposed, was to exemplify the inconsistency and contradiction of those, who cry up *private judgment* as a last authority in religion, and yet in this and similar cases, are not willing to let their principle prevail beyond certain metes

and bounds of their own imposition. The very caption of the article is "Private Judgment," and its whole aim and scope is, not to magnify this, certainly, but to bring it into discredit. How should it be imagined, then, to go in favor of such individualism, under its most rampant form? It is throughout, an *argumentum ad hominem*. It takes Puritanism, or Independency, on its own premises, and charges it in the case of Mr. Lesley, (any similar case would have answered for illustration just as well,) with palpable and gross self-contradiction. In this view the argument is of full force. If the Church of the Creed be a phantom, and Christianity the sense simply of the Bible, as every "Tom, Dick and Harry" in the land, (*pax verbo,*) may choose to take it, we see not, certainly, on what ground any church censure can legitimately hold against the exercise of such independency in any form.

Such we take to be the drift and purpose of this offending article. If, however, it might be supposed by any to carry covertly a different sense, nothing could be more unfair, surely, than to lay the burden of such different sense on the general character of the Review; contradicted, as any child might see it to be, by the whole spirit and bearing of the Review itself, from the beginning. It has been asked, whether the Church in which *we* stand would not also exclude a man for grave confessional errors. We reply, it would do so certainly. The uniform doctrine, moreover, of this Review has been, that the right as well as the duty to preserve the faith once delivered to the saints, resides by divine appointment in the Church. Private judgment and independency, in the ultra Puritan sense, we do not allow, but consider rather to be in bad opposition to Christ and Christianity. The sect spirit thus we hold to be emphatically *Antichrist*. It is all in order, therefore, for *us* to insist on church authority and the evil of schism. But it is not in order for those to do so, who profess to give full scope to the sect maxim: "No creed but the Bible and private judgment." When *they*, notwithstanding, in virtue of their associated judgment, pretend to lay bit and bridle on the principle of independency where it varies from themselves, and charge it with "come-outerism," as the word goes, for being independent in such separate style, they give the lie to their own

principle, and may well be called upon to explain and justify the contradiction involved in their conduct.

The "Presbyterian," we understand, finds it a bad sign against us, that we are against creeds; on the familiar adage, that men do not oppose creeds commonly till creeds come to be in opposition first to themselves. The "Puritan," on the other hand, finds it a bad sign that we make too much of creeds. "Those," we are told, "who give to the creed and tradition an authority superior to that of the Scriptures, can hardly be inconsistent in endorsing for one who denies the plenary inspiration of the Bible." These two insinuations, of course, do not cohere very well together. For any fair reader of our Review, both must be taken as simple balderdash.

We are not opposed to creeds. No one can go against creeds, who goes for the Church as an article of faith. The difficulty with us here is, not in the too little of our faith, for the taste of the dissatisfied, but in its *too much*. To oppose sects, is not to oppose creeds; but just the reverse. What is needed above all things to upset their tyrannical arbitrariness, is the sense of a true catholic tradition springing from the life of the Church, in a real way, as it has stood from the beginning. This starts beyond all controversy in the Apostles' Creed; while on this foundation it makes room for much more, in the way of historical orthodox faith, comprehended with more or less success in later symbols, Catholic and Protestant, which the Church is bound to acknowledge and respect to the end of the world. For creeds, (so called,) that affect to set aside the foundation creed of Christianity, substituting for it some original scheme of their own, we do entertain, it is true, but small admiration or regard. But such upstart faith is itself at war with the true idea of a creed. It makes no account of history, but just fancies its own system from the skies. The sect spirit is universally unhistorical, and so, to the same extent, *creedless*. Those who oppose creeds, on the other hand, (independents, radicals, come-outers,) are always unhistorical. We go with all our might for the idea of the Church, for the Apostles' Creed, for catholic tradition, for historical Christianity; as the only refuge and help from the horrid evils, that seem to yawn upon us continually from the abyss of the unchurchly system.

Is this to wrong the Bible? So thinks the "Puritan"; but so think not we. We have full faith in its inspiration, and own its authority to be supreme in all questions of religion. But you "give to the Creed and tradition an authority superior to that of the Scriptures?" Not at all. We give to them only an authority superior, at worst, to that of the Puritan scheme of thought, the New England tradition, so far forth as this same may be found seeking to thrust the old faith out of the way. Forced to an election between two conflicting traditions, one resting in the Apostles' Creed, and the other charging it with *heresy*, we choose the first, as on the whole more rational and safe than the second. This is the only true issue in the case. To make the Puritan tradition *per se* the same thing with the Bible, is but an impudent begging of the whole question in debate. We do not believe that Puritanism, as distinguished from the old catholic sense of the Creed, expresses at all the true sense of the Bible; and we have yet to learn by what right we are to be shut up to its authority here, that is a whit better, to say the least, than that claimed to the same purport by the Church of Rome. Why should the fathers of New England be counted more infallible, as interpreters of the Bible, than the fathers of the ancient Church in Africa or Asia Minor? Did these last love the Bible less? Had Augustine less regard for its authority than Edwards? *Why*, to show my obedience to the Bible, must I give up the Creed, and immerse my mind in the element of Puritanism only in its stead? To say: "Come to the Bible, without *any* medium," is pitiful nonsense. No man *can* come to it in that way: and the least really free in their approach to it ordinarily, are just those who are most forward to dream and talk of their freedom in any such fantastical style.

## ART. XLV.—THE LITURGICAL MOVEMENT.

THE late meeting of the German Reformed Synod at Norristown, is allowed, on all hands, to have been one which it was a privilege to attend. It was characterized throughout by a good spirit. Among its proceedings, the action taken on the subject of a new liturgy, is entitled to special interest. This was based on an able report, presented by the Rev. Mr. Bomberger, chairman of a committee to which the general question had been referred a year before by the Synod at Hagerstown. The report consisted of a proper historical introduction or preamble, setting forth the general posture of the early Church, and of the Church at the Reformation, in regard to worship, and of a series of resolutions, issuing in favor of an immediate movement, at this time, for the formation of a liturgy suitable to the wants of the body represented by the Synod. The whole led to an animated discussion of nearly two days, which served, far beyond all that was expected in the beginning, to bring out the result of a general substantial agreement and harmony of views. With very slight modification, the entire report was adopted. The resolutions affirm: 1. That the use of liturgical forms falls in clearly with the practice and genius of the original Protestant Church; 2. That no reason exists in the state of the present American German Church, to justify a departure from this ancient usage; 3. That the Liturgy now authorized is inadequate to the wants of the Church, as apart from other defects it makes no provision for *ordinary* occasions of public worship; 4. That while the older Reformed Liturgies are in general worthy of adoption, there is still need of various modifications to adapt them fully to our circumstances and wants; 5. That the present time is as favorable for new action in the case, as any that can be anticipated hereafter; 6. That it is expedient, accordingly, to proceed forthwith in the business of providing a new Liturgy. In conformity with the conclusion thus reached, a large committee was appointed to report, at the next meeting of the Synod, a scheme or plan of such a Liturgy as the interests of the Church may be supposed to require, with certain parts made more or less complete, in the

way of specimen and rule, that may be expected to govern subsequently the construction of the whole. It is a matter for congratulation, certainly, that so auspicious a commencement is at length made in this high and solemn work. For two years past, the subject has been, in a certain sense, before the mind of the Church ; in such a way, however, unfortunately, that it has not been able to come to any fair and open discussion. No one could show any good reason, why the liturgical question should *not* be treated, in the German Church, with the most unreserved freedom ; and yet there has been evidently a feeling of embarrassment in venturing to approach it, and a disposition to hold it at arm's length, which has stood thus far much in the way of a just consideration of its rights and claims. In the mean time, as it now appears, the want that needs to be supplied in this direction, has been steadily making itself to be more and more felt, on all sides ; until at length it is found, as it were, forcing its own way to the clear utterance, from which it had been so long previously withheld and restrained. The preparation for a new Liturgy has been altogether more general and deep, it would seem, than most had before imagined. The Synod, at the start, was by no means clear in regard to its own mind. Discussion, once fairly set free, caused a whole world of fog to pass away ; and the body was taken with a sort of surprise, in the end, at the unanimity of its views and feelings, where it had been so needlessly haunted with the spectre of controversy and discord. The discussion had in all respects a happy effect. The interest taken in it, too, by the community, bore testimony to its importance. Such a question, involving what pertains to the interior life of the Church, always commands attention and respect, when treated by an ecclesiastical body in an earnest and manly way. The more, too, any such body can be led to exercise its interest, in this way, on questions that enter into the real life of the Church, to the exclusion of what would suit just as well for a Temperance Society or any other like voluntary and merely human association, the more may it be expected to rise always in the actual dignity of its own character, as well as in the solemnity of all its proceedings.

As the case now stands, the door is thrown open, of course, for the most free discussion of the whole liturgical question

Not only is such discussion allowed, but it is loudly demanded and required. It is not enough here to act ; we need intelligent action. It is not enough to follow a mere blind sense of want, or to obey a tendency however good ; we need clear insight into our want, and rational mastery over our own movement. This cannot be without much thought, much consultation and debate. It is not enough, of course, that the ministers, and some of the elders, be satisfied ; the case requires that the people, the churches generally, should have their attention turned seriously to the subject, their views enlightened, their hearts disposed and prepared for what may be done. This is indeed just one of the last cases in which any end is to be carried by management or trick. No one need fear discussion. The Church can never be hurried into a Liturgy, without her own consent ; her own full, free and hearty consent ; and if discussion and inquiry may serve to carry her where she would not be prepared to go otherwise, who can have a right to say that such movement is irrational or wrong. If we are to have a Liturgy at all, it is of the utmost consequence that we should have a good one ; and this requires, in the first place, a true and just idea of what a Liturgy means, and in the second place, some general inward preparation for the use of one in its proper form. We have no right then, and nobody surely should have any wish to prevent the most full and free study of the subject in all its length and breadth, in order that if possible these necessary conditions of success, in so vast and solemn an enterprise, may be duly secured. We have no right to lay down limits and bounds, within which only the Church is to be considered free to exercise her liberty in this form. The entire question is open. Let the subject be examined without prejudice, or deference to surrounding prejudice, or shy jealousy of any particular *tendency* ; as though a "tendency" might hoodwink a whole Church out of its sober rationality, and we would forestall all that, and take care of its proper liberty, by laying a bridle on its neck beforehand, to keep it from going too far ! The danger here, is not in free inquiry, but in the want of it. What is most of all to be deprecated, is the formation of an unripe Liturgy ; one that may fall behind the true inward demands of the interest itself, and that may fail, accordingly, to satisfy in the end

the very want from which it springs. No Liturgy can go far beyond the reigning idea of worship, which it is brought in to assist and serve; and if this be still incomplete, or a confused tendency only, perhaps, which has not yet got to its own proper end, the result is likely to be a sort of buckram invention, which will sit stiffly on the Church for the time, and prove at last a mere form too irksome for its better life to endure.

Everything here depends on starting right. Our Liturgy will take its character and complexion finally, from the conception we have of the end it is designed to serve. If it is taken to be a mere outward help and convenience for the purposes of public worship, a sort of crutch to assist the decent conduct of our sanctuary devotions, it is not to be expected that we shall be able to bring it to anything better than such poor mechanical character. Better no Liturgy at all, we say from the bottom of our heart, than one produced from such a spirit and constructed on such a plan. In such case, indeed, its services must deserve to be called *forms* in the bad sense, such as can serve only to generate bondage and not freedom. A Liturgy so adopted, is like the notion of civil government, as taken by a certain school to be a prudential compact, in which men part with some of their rights to be more sure of the rest. Government, in any right view, is the form in which the very idea of our human life becomes real and complete. So we say, the very idea of worship itself demands a liturgy; this is the very form, in which it requires to hold, in order that it may come to its own most true and perfect sense. If there be no need for a liturgy in the idea of Christian worship, in itself considered; if it is to be taken at best, but as an accommodation to the necessities of the ignorant and weak, like the exercises of an infant school designed for infants only; we are ready to say, the sooner the subject is dismissed from our thoughts the better. If we are to have a Liturgy that is worth anything, we must seek it and accept it under a widely different view. We must see, that it involves no bondage, but freedom. We must embrace it, not as a burden but as a relief, not as a yoke but as a crown, not as a minimum of evil simply, but as a maximum of privilege and good. The bondage lies, of a truth, wholly on the other side. The conception of a liturgy in the true sense, as

compared with our reigning unliturgical and *free* worship, is the conception of a real emancipation into the liberty of the children of God. Argument and debate here, that are not led by the idea of worship itself, but turn on other considerations altogether, whether they go for or against a liturgy, are of very small account; of just as little worth, in truth, as a controversy about art, by those who have never yet felt what art means, and for whom all artistic creations are alike destitute of inward law and soul. Worship, like art, has a life and nature of its own. It involves, in its very constitution, certain principles, elements, and rules, which must be understood and turned to right account, to make it complete. To deny this, or to have no sense of it, is to stand convicted at once of entire incompetency to say one word rationally on the subject here in consideration. Any true analysis of the nature of worship, any proper resolution of it into its necessary constituents and conditions, we have no doubt at all, must bring us to see and feel that it requires a liturgy, and that a vast loss is suffered where it is violently forced to move under any less perfect and free form. All unliturgical worship, is to the same extent, rude, cumbersome and incomplete. Nature is a divine liturgy throughout. The life of heaven, still more, is a liturgy, "like the sound of many waters," of the most magnificent and sublime order. What we need, in our present movement, is the full sense of what worship means in this view; sympathy with the music of the spheres, and with the song of the angels; the same mind that led the early Church into the universal use of liturgies, without opposition or contradiction, so far as history shows, from any quarter.

N.

